The Journal of Historical Review

Robert John

Behind the Balfour Declaration: Britain's War Pledge to Rothschild

Michiko Hasegawa

A Postwar View of The Greater East Asia War

Michael A. Hoffman II

Psychology and Epistemology of 'Holocaust' Newspeak

L.A. Rollins

Azriel Eisenberg's 'Amazing Stories'

—Historical News and Comment—

Rauschning's Phony 'Conversations With Hitler—An Update • *Stalin Prepared for Summer 1941 Attack* • *Churchill Wanted to "Drench" Germany With Poison Gas* • *Millions Go Into New Museums* • *Chicago Tribune History*

Volume Six, Number Four *Winter 1985-86*

The Journal of Historical Review

VOLUME SIX, NUMBER 4 / WINTER 1985-86

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

WALTER B. ALLENDE, Ph.D.
University of Buenos Aires
Buenos Aires, Argentina

GEORGE ASHLEY, Ph.D.
Los Angeles Unified School District
History Instructor

JOHN BENNETT, L.L.B.
Australian Civil Liberties Union
Melbourne, Australia

ARTHUR R. BUTZ, Ph.D.
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

ALBERT J. ECKSTEIN, Ph.D.
Private Research Consultant

ROBERT FAURISSON, Ph.D.
University of Lyon-2
Lyon, France

DITLIEB FELDERER
Revisionist History Magazine
Taby, Sweden

SAMUEL E. KONKIN III
The New Libertarian
Long Beach, California

MARTIN A. LARSON, Ph.D.
The Spotlight
Washington, D.C.

WILLIAM B. LINDSEY, Ph.D.
Research Chemist

JAMES J. MARTIN, Ph.D.
Ralph Myles Publishers
Colorado Springs, Colorado

REVILO P. OLIVER, Ph.D.
University of Illinois (Ret.)
Urbana, Illinois

WILHELM STAEGLICH, Dr. Jur. (Ret.)
Badenweiler, West Germany

UDO WALENDY, Diplo. Pol.
Verlag fuer Volkstum und
Zeitgeschichtsforschung
Vlotho/Weser, West Germany

MARK WEBER
The Historical Review Committee

ANDREAS R. WESSERLE, Ph.D.
Marquette University (Ret.)
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

The Journal of Historical Review is published quarterly by the Institute for Historical Review, Post Office Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505. Subscriptions include the *IHR Newsletter*, an eventful journal of interest to academic and lay historical revisionists, issued eight times per year on the alternate months of issue of *The Journal of Historical Review*. Combined subscription price is $30 per year, $50 for two years, and $70 for three years. Add $10 per year for domestic first class delivery. Add $10 per year for foreign subscriptions. Add $20 per year for overseas airmail delivery. Remittances for subscriptions must be payable in U.S. dollars. Add $5 if funds are drawn on a non-U.S. bank. Quantity subscription and bulk issue rates are available on request. Appropriate manuscripts are welcomed by the editor, and must be accompanied by return postage.

Listed:

Library of Congress
British Library
PTLA Catalog
EBSCO Librarians Handbook
Ulrich's International Periodical Directory
Turner Periodical Catalog
Standard Periodical Directory

ISSN: 0195-6752

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, U.S.A.

The following articles appearing in this issue are copyrighted by their respective authors:

"Behind the Balfour Declaration" by Robert John,

"A Postwar View of the Greater East Asia War" by Michiko Hasegawa,

"The Psychology and Epistemology of Holocaust Newspeak" by Michael A. Hoffman II.

Other than the above, permission is hereby granted for reprints of any article contained herein, providing that no changes or alterations are made prior to printing, and also providing that the following attribution appears with the article:

Reprinted by permission of *The Journal of Historical Review*, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, United States of America. Domestic subscription rate: $30 per year; Foreign rate: $40 per year.

Two copies of each reprint should be submitted to the publisher of *The Journal of Historical Review*.

Table of Contents

Volume Six, No. 4 Winter 1985-86

Articles

Behind the Balfour Declaration: Britain's Great War Pledge To Lord Rothschild — 389
Robert John

A Postwar View of the Greater East Asia War — 451
Michiko Hasegawa

The Psychology and Epistemology of 'Holocaust' Newspeak — 467
Michael A. Hoffman II

Review Article

Azriel Eisenberg Presents: The Greatest Sob Story Ever Told (Azriel Eisenberg, *The Lost Generation*) — 479
L.A. Rollins

Historical News and Comment

Rauschning's Phony 'Conversations With Hitler'—An Update — 499

Stalin Prepared for Summer 1941 Attack — 501

Churchill Wanted to "Drench" Germany With Poison Gas — 501

National Holocaust Museum to Cost $100 Million — 503
Mark Weber

Los Angeles "Museum of Tolerance" to Cost $30 Million — 504

California Subsidizes Japanese-American Museum — 507
L.A. Rollins

Chicago Tribune History — 508
Michael A. Hoffman II

About the Contributors — 512

For More Reading on the Historical Consequences of
THE BALFOUR DECLARATION
Order These Postpaid Books from the
INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW
Post Office Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505

Origins of the Balfour Declaration by James A. Malcolm. Facsimile reproduction of a document issued by the British Museum. An insider's view of Chaim Weizmann's contribution to securing the notorious declaration which helped get the U.S. into World War I and guaranteed a future of unrelenting Middle East turmoil. 12pp, $2.

Zionism in the Age of the Dictators: A Reappraisal by Lenni Brenner. An astounding exposé of the active collaboration between Nazis and Zionists, written by a leftist anti-Zionist Jew. 277pp, $9.50.

The Zionist Connection II by Alfred Lilienthal. 904-page exposé and indictment of the Zionist Iron Curtain over America, authored by America's leading anti-Zionist Jew. Extraordinarily well-referenced. $15.

The Fateful Triangle: The U.S., Israel and the Palestinians by Noam Chomsky. A massive, scholarly account of the origins, development and consequences of the Zionist "Holy State" phenomenon, by the iconoclastic MIT professor. 481pp, $15.

Israel's Sacred Terrorism by Livia Rokach, with an introduction by Noam Chomsky. A study based on the diaries of Moshe Sharett, Israel's first foreign minister, and prime minister from 1953-1955. Reveals the incredible intrigues behind the formation and consolidation of the new state, and the reliance on terror by Israel's powerful "security establishment." 73pp, $6.

For The Record

With reference to my translation of Rudolf Jordan's article "Hitler, the Unemployed and Autarky" and my commentary, published in *The Journal*, Spring 1984, pp. 77-83, changes were introduced into my text by the editor, of which these two are the most notable:

(1) Page 81; the sentence (lines 12 to 14) that begins, "The actual statistics . . ." should read: "The statistics cited by the German historian Werner Maser answers these two questions." Galbraith does *not* quote these statistics.

(2) Page 82; the three sentences that conclude my commentary are not in the text I submitted to *The Journal*'s editor.

Page 81, at line three below the first indented passage in the parenthetical passage, "Jordan's view and Galbraith's," I neglected to footnote Galbraith's assertion that Keynesian deficit spending ensured Germany's prosperity; see *Money*, pp. 225 and 226. Also, see my footnotes 1 and 5, pp. 82 and 83.

Rudolf Jordan, I have sinced learned, was the Gauleiter of Magdeburg-Anhalt and is the author of the book, *Erlebt und Erlitten* (*Experienced and Endured*), published after the war. Mr. Mark Weber writes to me that Burton J. Klein's *Germany's Economic Preparations for War* "confirms your basic point." On p. 81 Dr. Klein concludes: "Actually, Germany's rearmament [before World War Two] was on a much smaller scale than was generally assumed and it did not involve a large drain of resources from the civilian economy."

—Ronald Klett

Behind the Balfour Declaration: Britain's Great War Pledge To Lord Rothschild

THE MEANING FOR US

ROBERT JOHN

(Paper Presented to the Fifth International Revisionist Conference)

Acknowledgements

To Benjamin H. Freedman, who committed himself to finding and telling the facts about Zionism and Communism, and encouraged others to do the same. The son of one of the founders of the American Jewish Committee, which for many years was anti-Zionist, Ben Freedman founded the League for Peace with Justice in Palestine in 1946. He gave me copies of materials on the Balfour Declaration which I might never have found on my own and encouraged my own research. (He died in April 1984.)

The Institute for Historical Review is providing means for the better understanding of the events of our time.

Attempts to review historical records impartially often reveal that blame, culpability, or dishonor are not to be attached wholly to one side in the conflicts of the last hundred years. To seek to untangle fact from propaganda is a worthy study, for it increases understanding of how we got where we are and it should help people resist exploitation by powerful and destructive interests in the present and future, by exposing their working in the past.

May I recommend to the Nobel Prize Committee that when the influence of this organization's historical review and search for truth has pervaded the societies of its contributors—say about 5 years or less from now—that they consider the IHR for the Nobel Peace Prize.

Regrettably, some of the company in that award would be hard to bear!

The Balfour Declaration may be the most extraordinary document produced by any government in world history. It took the form of a letter from the government of His Britannic Majesty King George the Fifth, the government of the largest empire the world has even known, on which—once upon a time—the sun never set; a letter to an international financier of the banking house of Rothschild who had been made a peer of the realm.

Arthur Koestler wrote that in the letter "one nation solemnly promised to a second nation the country of a third." More than that, the country was still part of the empire of a fourth, namely Turkey.

It read:

> Foreign Office, November 2nd, 1917
>
> Dear Lord Rothschild,
>
> I have much pleasure in conveying to you on behalf of His Majesty's Government the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations, which has been submitted to and approved by the Cabinet:
>
> "His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."
>
> I should be grateful if you would bring this Declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.
>
> Yours sincerely,
> Arthur James Balfour.[1]

It was decided by Lord Allenby that the "Declaration" should not then be published in Palestine where his forces were still south of the Gaza-Beersheba line. This was not done until after the establishment of the Civil Administration in 1920.

Why was the "Declaration" made a year before the end of what was called The Great War?

"The people" were told at the time that it was given as a return for a debt of gratitude which they were supposed to owe to the Zionist leader (and first President of Israel), Chaim Weizman, a Russian-born immigrant to Britain from Germany who was said to have invented a process of fermentation of horse chestnuts into scarce acetone for production of high explosives by the Ministry of Munitions.

This horse chestnut propaganda production was not dislodged from the mass mind by the short bursts of another story which was used officially between the World Wars.

So let us dig into the records and bury the chestnuts forever.

To know where to explore we must stand back from the event and look over some parts of the relevant historical background. The terrain is extensive and the mud deep, so I shall try to proceed by pointing out markers.

Herzl on the Jewish Problem

Support for a "national home" for the Jews in Palestine from the government of the greatest empire in the world was in part a fulfillment of the efforts and scheming of Theodore Herzl (1860–1904), descendant of Sephardim (on his rich father's side), who had published *Der Judenstaat* (The Jewish State) in Vienna in 1896. It outlined the factors which he believed had created a universal Jewish problem, and offered a program to regulate it through the exodus of unhappy and unwanted Jews to an autonomous territory of their own in a national-socialist setting.

Herzl offered a focus for a Zionist movement founded in Odessa in 1881, which spread rapidly through the Jewish communities of Russia, and small branches which had sprung up in Germany, England and elsewhere. Though "Zion" referred to a geographical location, it functioned as a utopian conception in the myths of traditionalists, modernists and Zionists alike. It was the reverse of everything rejected in the actual Jewish situation in the "Dispersion," whether oppression or assimilation.

In his diary Herzl describes submitting his draft proposals to the Rothschild Family Council, noting: "I bring to the Rothschilds and the big Jews their historical mission. I shall welcome all men of goodwill—we must be united—and crush all those of bad."[2]

He read his manuscript "Addressed to the Rothschilds" to a friend, Meyer-Cohn, who said,

> Up till now I have believed that we are not a nation—but more than a nation. I believed that we have the historic mission of being the exponents of universalism among the nations and therefore were more than a people identified with a specific land.

Herzl replied:

> Nothing prevents us from being and remaining the exponents of a united humanity, when we have a country of our own. To fulfill this mission we do not have to remain literally planted among the nations who hate and despite us. If, in our present circumstances, we wanted to bring about the unity of mankind independent of national boundaries, we would have to combat the ideal of patriotism. The latter, however, will prove stronger than we for innumerable years to come."[2a]

In this era, there were a number of Christians and Messianic groups who looked for a Jewish "return." One of these was the

Protestant chaplain at the British Embassy in Vienna, who had published a book in 1882: *The Restoration of the Jews to Palestine According to the Prophets.* Through him, Herzl obtained an audience of the Grand Duke of Baden, and as they waited for their appointment to go to the castle, Herzl said to Chaplain Hechler, "When I go to Jerusalem I shall take you with me."

The Duke gave Herzl's proposal his consideration, and agreed to Herzl's request that he might refer to it in his meetings outside of Baden. He then used this to open his way to higher levels of power.

Through intermediaries, he endeavoured to ingratiate himself with the Sultan of Turkey by activities designed to reduce the agitation by emigre Armenian committees in London and Brussels for Turkish reforms and cessation of oppression,* and started a press campaign to calm public opinion in London on the Armenian question. But when offered money for Palestine, the Sultan replied that his people had won their Empire with blood, and owned it. "The Jews may spare their millions. When my Empire is divided, perhaps they will get Palestine for nothing. But only our corpse can be divided. I will never consent to vivisection."[2b]

Herzl met the Papal Nuncio in Vienna and promised the exclusion of Jerusalem, Bethlehem and Nazareth from the Jewish state. He started a Zionist newspaper—*Die Welt*, and was delighted to hear from the United States that a group of rabbis headed by Dr. Gustave Gottheil favored a Zionist movement. All this, and more, in a few months.

It was Herzl who created the first Zionist Congress at Basel, Switzerland, 29-31 August 1897.** There were 197 "delegates"; some were orthodox, some nationalist, liberal, atheist, culturalist, anarchist, socialist and some capitalist.

"We want to lay the foundation stone of the house which is to shelter the Jewish nation," and "Zionism seeks to obtain for the Jewish people a publicly recognized, legally secured homeland in Palestine," declared Herzl. And his anti-assimilationist dictum

---

*A letter entered in Herzl's diary on 15 May 1896 states that the head of the Armenian movement in London is Avetis Nazarbek, "and he directs the paper *Huntchak* (The Bell). He will be spoken to."

**On either side of the main doorway of the hall hung white banners with two blue stripes, and over the doorway was placed a six-pointed "Shield of David." It was the invention of David Wolffsohn, who employed the colors of the traditional Jewish prayer shawl. Fifty years later, the combined emblems became the flag of the Zionist state. The "Shield of David" is of Assyrian origin; previously a decorative motif or magical emblem. It appeared on the heraldic flag of the Jews in Prague in 1527.

that "Zionism is a return to the Jewish fold even before it is a return to the Jewish land," was an expression of his own experience which was extended into the official platform of Zionism as the aim of "strengthening the Jewish national sentiment and national consciousness."[3]

Another leading figure who addressed the Congress was Max Nordau, a Hungarian Jewish physician and author, who delivered a polemic against assimilated Jews. "For the first time the Jewish problem was presented forcefully before a European forum," wrote Weizmann. But the Russian Jews thought Herzl was patronizing them as Askenazim. They found his "western dignity did not sit well with our Russian-Jewish realism; and without wanting to, we could not help irritating him."[4]

As a result of the Congress, the "Basle Protocol," keystone of the world Zionist movement, was adopted as follows:

> Zionism strives to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law. The Congress contemplates the following means to the attainment of this end:
>
> 1. The promotion on suitable lines of the colonization of Palestine by Jewish agricultural and industrial workers.
> 2. The organization and binding together of the whole of Jewry by means of appropriate institutions, local and international, in accordance with the laws of each country.
> 3. The strengthening and fostering of Jewish national sentiment and consciousness.
> 4. Preparatory steps towards obtaining Government consent where necessary to the attainment of the aim of Zionism.[5]

The British *Chovevei-Zion* Association declined an invitation to be represented at the Congress, and the Executive Committee of the Association of Rabbis in Germany protested that:

> 1. The efforts of so-called Zionists to found a Jewish national state in Palestine contradict the messianic promise of Judaism as contained in the Holy Writ and in later religious sources.
> 2. Judaism obligates its adherents to serve with all devotion the Fatherland to which they belong, and to further its national interests with all their heart and with all their strength.
> 3. However, those noble aims directed toward the colonization of Palestine by Jewish peasants and farmers are not in contradiction to these obligations, because they have no relation whatsoever to the founding of a national state.[6]

In conversation with a delegate at the First Congress, Litman Rosenthal, Herzl said,

> It may be that Turkey will refuse or be unable to understand us. This will not discourage us. We will seek other means to accomplish our end. The Orient question is now the question of the day. Sooner

> or later it will bring about a conflict among the nations. *A European war is imminent*... The great European War must come. With my watch in hand do I await this terrible moment. After the great European war is ended the Peace Conference will assemble. We must be ready for that time. We will assuredly be called to this great conference of the nations and we must prove to them the urgent importance of a Zionist solution to the Jewish Question. We must prove to them that the problem of the Orient and Palestine is one with the problem of the Jews—both must be solved together. We must prove to them that the Jewish problem is a world problem and that a world problem must be solved by the world. And the solution must be the return of Palestine to the Jewish people. (*American Jewish News*, 7 March 1919)

A few months later, in a message to a Jewish conference in London, Herzl wrote "... the first moment I entered the Movement my eyes were directed towards England, because I saw that by reason of the general situation of things there it was the Archimedean point where the lever could be applied." Herzl showed his desire for some foothold in England, and also perhaps his respect for London as the world's financial center, by causing the Jewish Colonial Trust, which was to be the main financial instrument of his Movement, to be incorporated in 1899 as an English company.

Herzl was indefatigable. He offered the Sultan of Turkey help in re-organizing his financial affairs in return for assistance in Jewish settlement in Palestine.[7] To the Kaiser, who visited Palestine in 1888 and again in 1898,* he promised support for furthering German interests in the Near East; a similar offer was made to King Edward VII of England; and he personally promised the Pope to respect the holy places of Christendom in return for Vatican support.** But only from the Czar did he receive, through the Minister of the Interior, a pledge of "moral and material assistance with respect to the measures taken by the movement which would lead to a diminution of the Jewish population in Russia."[8]

He reported his work to the Sixth Zionist Congress at Basle on 23 August 1903, but stated, "Zion is not and can never be. It is merely an expedient for colonization purposes, but, be it well understood, an expedient founded on a national and political basis."[9]

---

*On the latter trip he was accompanied by his Empress. Their yacht, the *Hohenzollern*, put in at Haifa, and they were escorted to Jerusalem by 2,000 Turkish soldiers.

**Pope Pius X told him that the Church could not support the return of "infidel Jews" to the Holy Land.[10]

When pressed for Jewish colonization in Palestine, the Turkish Sublime Porte offered a charter for any other Turkish territory (with acceptance by the settlers of Ottoman citizenship) which Herzl refused.[11] The British Establishment, aware of Herzl's activities through his appearance before the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration,* and powerful press organs such as the *Daily Chronicle* and *Pall Mall Gazette* which were demanding a conference of the Powers to consider the Zionist program,[12] somewhat characteristically, had shown a willingness to negotiate about a Jewish colony in the Egyptian territory of El-'Arish on the Turco-Egyptian frontier in the Sinai Peninsula. But the Egyptian Government objected to making Nile water available for irrigation; the Turkish Government, through its Commissioner in Cairo, objected; and the British Agent in Cairo, Lord Cromer, finally advised the scheme's rejection.[13]

Meanwhile, returning from a visit to British East Africa in the Spring of 1903, Prime Minister Joseph Chamberlain put to Herzl the idea of a Jewish settlement in what was soon to become the Colony of Kenya, but through a misunderstanding Herzl believed that Uganda was intended, and it was referred to as the "Uganda scheme." Of the part of the conversation on the El-'Arish proposal, Herzl wrote in his diary that he had told Chamberlain that eventually we shall gain our aims "not from the goodwill but from the jealously of the Powers."[14] With the failure of the El-'Arish proposal, Herzl authorized the preparation of a draft scheme for settlement in East Africa. This was prepared by the legal firm of Lloyd George, Roberts and Company, on the instructions of Herzl's go-between with the British Government, Leopold Greenberg.[15]

Herzl urged acceptance of the "Uganda scheme," favoring it as a temporary refuge, but he was opposed from all sides, and died suddenly of heart failure on 3 July 1904. Herzl's death rid the Zionists of an "alien," and he was replaced by David Wolffsohn (the Litvak**).[16]

The "Uganda proposal" split the Zionist movement. Some who favored it formed the Jewish Territorial Organization, under the leadership of Israel Zangwill (1864–1926). For these territorialists, the renunciation of "Zion" was not generally felt as an ideological sacrifice; instead they contended that not mystical claims to "historic attachment" but present conditions should determine the location of a Jewish national homeland.[17]

---

*In 1880, there were about 60,000 Jews in England. Between 1881 and 1905, there was an immigration of some 100,000 Eastern Jews. Though cut by the Aliens Bill of the Balfour Government, which became law in the summer of 1905, immigration continued so that by 1914 there was a Jewish population in England of some 300,000. A leader of the fight against the Aliens Bill and against tightening up naturalization regulations in 1903–1904 was Winston S. Churchill.[18]

**The Eastern Jews referred to each other as "Litvaks" (Lithuania), "Galizianers" (Galicia), "Polaks," "Hungarians," and geographical regions of their ancestral origin, e.g., "Pinskers"; never by the term *Jew*.

In Turkey, the "Young Turk" (Committee of Union and Progress) revolution of 1908 was ostensibly a popular movement opposed to foreign influence. However, Jews and crypto-Jews known as *Dunmeh* had played a leading part in the Revolution.[19]

The Zionists opened a branch of the Anglo-Palestine Bank in the Turkish capital, and the bank became the headquarters of their work in the Ottoman Empire. Victor Jacobson* was brought from Beirut, "ostensibly to represent the Anglo-Palestine Company, but really to make Zionist propaganda among the Turkish Jews."[20] His contacts included both political parties, discussions with Arab members of Parliament from Syria and Palestine, and a general approach to young Ottoman intellectuals through a newspaper issued by the Zionist office.[21] In Turkey, as in Germany, "Their own native Jews were resentful of the attempt to segregate them as Jews and were opposed to the intrusion of Jewish nationalism in their domestic affairs." Though several periodicals in French "were subvened" by the Zionist-front office under Dr. Victor Jacobson,[22] (the first Zionist who aspired to be not a Zionist leader but a "career" diplomat,) and although he built up good political connections through social contacts, "always avoiding the sharpness of a direct issue, and waiting in patient oriental fashion for the insidious seed of propaganda to fructify,"[23] yet some of those engaged in the work, notably Vladimir (Zev) Jabotinsky (1880–1940), came to despair of success so long as the Ottoman Empire controlled Palestine. They henceforth pinned their hopes on its collapse.[24]

At the 10th Congress in 1911, David Wolffsohn, who had succeeded Herzl, said in his presidential address that what the Zionists wanted was not a Jewish state but a homeland,[26] while Max Nordau denounced the "infamous traducers," who alleged that "the Zionists . . . wanted to worm their way into Turkey in order to seize Palestine . . . It is our duty to convince (the Turks) that . . . they possess in the whole world no more generous and self-sacrificing friends than the Zionists."*[27]

---

*(1869–1935). Born in the Crimea, and nurtured in the atmosphere of assimilation and revolutionary agitation in Russia, Jacobson had organized clubs and written about Zionism in Russian Jewish newspapers. After the First World War, the era of the direct and indirect bribe and the contact man gave way to one in which the interests of nationalities, represented by diplomat-attorneys, had to be met, wrote Lipsky: "In this new world into which Jacobson was thrown, he laboured with the delicacy and concentration of an artist . . . working persistently and with vision to build up an interest in the cause. He had to win sympathy as well as conviction."[25]

The mild sympathy which the Young Turks had shown for Zionism was replaced by suspicion as growing national unrest threatened the Ottoman Empire, especially in the Balkans. Zionist policy then shifted to the Arabs, so that they might think of Zionism as a possible make-weight against the Turks. But Zionists soon observed that their reception by Arab leaders grew warmer as the Arabs were disappointed in their hopes of gaining concessions from the Turks, but cooled swiftly when these hopes revived. The more than 60 Arab parliamentary delegates in Constantinople and the newly active Arabic press kept up "a drumfire of complaints" against Jewish immigration, land purchase and settlement in Palestine.[28]

"After many years of striving, the conviction was forced upon us that we stood before a blank wall, which it was impossible for us to surmount by ordinary political means," said Weizmann of the last pre-war Zionist Congress. But the strength of the national will forged for itself two main roads towards its goal—the gradual extension and strengthening of our *Yishuv* (Hebrew: literally, "settlement," a collective name for the Jewish settlers) in Palestine and the spreading of the Zionist idea throughout the length and breadth of Jewry.[29]

The Turks were doing all they could to keep Jews out of Palestine. But this barrier was covertly surmounted, partly due to the venality of Turkish officials,[30] (as delicately put in a Zionist report—"it was always possible to get round the individual official with a little artifice");[32] and partly to the diligence of the Russian consuls in Palestine in protecting Russian Jews and saving them from expulsion.[33]

But if Zionism were to succeed in its ambitions, Ottoman rule of Palestine must end. Arab independence could be prevented by the intervention of England and France, Germany or Russia. The Eastern Jews hated Czarist Russia. With the *entente cordiale* in existence, it was to be Germany or England, with the odds slightly in Britain's favor in potential support of the Zionist aim in Palestine,

---

*In the Zionist Congress of 1911, (22 years before Hitler came to power, and three years before World War I), Nordau said, "How dare the smooth talkers, the clever official blabbers, open their mouths and boast of progress . . . Here they hold jubilant peace conferences in which they talk against war . . . But the same righteous governments, who are so nobly, industriously active to establish the eternal peace, are preparing, by their own confession, *complete annihilation for six million people,* and there is nobody, except the doomed themselves, to raise his voice in protest although this is a worse crime than any war . . ."[31]

as well as in military power.* On the other hand, Zionism was attracting some German and Austrian Jews with important financial interests and had to take into account strong Jewish anti-Zionist opinion in England.

But before Zionism had finally reckoned it could gain no special consideration in Palestine from Turkey, the correspondent of *The Times* was able to report in a message published 14 April 1911, of the Zionist organ *Jeune Turc's*** "violent hostility to England" and "its germanophile enthusiasm," and to the propaganda carried on among Turkish Jews by "German Zionist agents." When the policy line altered, this impression in England had to be erased.[34] The concern of the majority of rich English Jews was not allayed by articles in the *Jewish Chronicle*, edited by Leopold Greenberg, pointing out that in the Basle program there was "not a word of any autonomous Jewish state,"[35] and in *Die Welt*, the official organ of the Movement, the article by Nahum Sokolow, then the General Secretary of the Zionist Organization, in which he protested that there was no truth in the allegation that Zionism aimed at the establishment of an independent Jewish State.[36] Even at the 11th Congress in 1913, Otto Warburg, speaking as chairman of the Zionist Executive, gave assurances of loyalty to Turkey, adding that in colonizing Palestine and developing its resources, Zionists would be making a valuable contribution to the progress of the Turkish Empire.[37]

The Great War

Until mid-1914, the surface of European diplomatic relations was placid, reflecting successfully negotiated settlements of colonial and other questions. But certain British journalists were charged by their contemporaries "that they deliberately set out to poison Anglo-German relations and to create by their scaremongering such a climate of public opinion that war between the two Great Powers became inevitable." (*The Scaremongers: The Advocacy of War and Rearmament*

---

*Approximate annual expenditure for military purposes by the European Powers in the first years of the century were: France— £38,400,000; Germany— £38,000,000; Italy— £15,000,000; Russia— £43,000,000; United States— £38,300,000; Great Britain— £69,000,000 at pre-1914 values of sterling.

**Its business manager was a German Jew, Sam Hochberg. Among invited contributors was the immensely wealthy Russian Jew Alexander Helphand who, as "Parvus," was later to suggest to the German left-wing parties that Lenin and his associates be sent to Russia in 1917 to demoralize still further the beaten Russian armies.

1896–1914, A.J.A. Morris, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984) Were they paid or pure? Every anti-German diatribe in British newspapers added to German government concern as to whether it was part of a policy instigated or condoned by Downing Street. Further, there were groups in every major European country which could see only in war the possible means to further their interests or to thwart the ambitions of their rivals. This is why the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir-apparent to the Austro-Hungarian throne, on 28 June in Sarajevo, soon set Europe crackling with fire, a fire which naturally spread through the lines of communications to colonial territories as far away as China.

On 28 July, Austria declared war on Serbia. Germany sent an ultimatum to Russia threatening hostilities if orders for total mobilization of the Russian army and navy were not countermanded.

A telegram dated 29 July 1914 from the Czar Nicholas to the Emperor Wilhelm, proposing that the Austro-Serbian dispute should be referred to the Hague Tribunal, remained unanswered. At the same time Germany sent a message to France asking if she would remain neutral; but France, which had absorbed issue after issue of Russian railroad bonds in addition to other problems, was unequivocal in supporting Russia. Amid mounting tension and frontier violations, Germany declared war on Russia and France. The French Chief-of-Staff, General Joseph Joffre, was prepared to march into Belgium if the Germans first violated its neutrality[38] which had been guaranteed by Britain, France, Prussia, Austria and Russia. German troops crossed the Belgian frontier (on 4 August at 8 a.m.) and the United Kingdom declared war on Germany.

First Pledge

Lord Kitchener, who had left London at 11:30 on the morning of 3 August to return to Egypt after leave, was stopped at Dover and put in charge of the War Office.[39] At the first meeting of the War Council he warned his colleagues of a long struggle which would be won not at sea but on land, for which Britain would have to raise an army of millions of men and maintain them in the field for several years.[40] When the defense of Egypt was discussed at the meeting, Winston Churchill suggested that the ideal method of defending Egypt was to attack the Gallipoli Peninsula which, if successful, would give Britain control of the Dardenelles. But this operation was very difficult, and required a large force. He preferred the alternative of a feint at Gallipoli, and a landing at Haifa or some other point on the Syrian coast.

In Turkey, the Sultan had taken the title of *Khalif-al-Islam*, or supreme religious leader of Moslems everywhere, and emissaries were dispatched to Arab chiefs with instructions that in the event of Turkey being involved in the European hostilities, they were to declare a *jihad*, or Moslem holy war. A psychological and physical force which Kitchener of Khartoum, the avenger of General Gordon's death, understood very well.

Kitchener planned to draw the sting of the *jihad*, which could affect British-Indian forces and rule in the East, by promoting an Arab revolt to be led by Hussein, who had been allowed by the Turks to assume his hereditary dignity as *Sherif* of Mecca and titular ruler of the Hejaz. Kitchener cabled on 13 October 1914 to his son, Abdullah, in Mecca, saying that if the Arab nation assisted England in this war, England would guarantee that no internal intervention took place in Arabia, and would give the Arabs every assistance against external aggression.

A series of letters passed between Sherif Hussein and the British Government through Sir Henry McMahon, High Commissioner for Egypt, designed to secure Arab support for the British in the Great War. One dated 24 October 1915 committed HMG to the inclusion of Palestine within the boundaries of Arab independence after the war, but excluded the area now known as Lebanon. This is clearly recognized in a secret "Memorandum on British Commitments to King Hussein" prepared for the inner group at the Peace Conference in 1919. (See Appendix) I found a copy in 1964 among the papers of the late Professor Wm. Westermann, who had been adviser on Turkish affairs to the American Delegation to the Peace Conference.

The Second Pledge

As the major ally, France's claim to preference in parts of Syria could not be ignored. The British Foreign Minister, Sir Edward Grey, told the French Ambassador in London, Mr. Paul Cambon, on 21 October 1915, of the exchanges of correspondence with Sherif Hussein, and suggested that the two governments arrive at an understanding with their Russian ally on their future interests in the Ottoman Empire.

M. Picot was appointed French representative with Sir Mark Sykes, now Secretary of the British War Cabinet, to define the interests of their countries and to go to Russia to include that country's views in their agreement.

In the subsequent secret discussions with Foreign Secretary Sazonov, Russia was accorded the occupation of Constantinople, both shores of the Bosphorus and some parts of "Turkish" Armenia.* France claimed Lebanon and Syria eastwards to

---

*This new offer to Russia of a direct outlet into the Mediterranean is a measure of the great importance attached by Britain and France to con-

Mosul. Palestine did in fact have inhabitants and shrines of the Greek and Russian Orthodox and Armenian churches, and Russia at first claimed a right to the area as their protector. This was countered by Sykes-Picot and the claim was withdrawn to the extent that Russia, in consultation with the other Allies, would only participate in deciding a form of international administration for Palestine.

The Sykes-Picot Agreement was incompatible with the pledges made to the Arabs. When the Turks gave Hussein details of the Agreement after the Russian revolution, he confined his action to a formal repudiation.

Like the Hussein-McMahon Correspondence, the Tripartite Agreement made no mention of concessions to Zionism in the future disposition of Palestine, or even mention of the word "Jew." However it is now known that before the departure of Sykes* for Petrograd on 27 February 1916 for discussions with Sazonov, he was approached with a plan by Herbert Samuel, who had a seat in the Cabinet as President of the Local Government Board and was strongly sympathetic to Herzl's Zionism.[41]

The plan put forward by Samuel was in the form of a memorandum which Sykes thought prudent to commit to memory and destroy. Commenting on it, Sykes wrote to Samuel suggesting that if Belgium should assume the administration of Palestine it might be more acceptable to France as an alternative to the international administration which she wanted and the Zionists did not.[42] Of boundaries marked on a map attached to the memorandum he wrote, "By excluding Hebron and the East of the Jordan there is less to discuss with the Moslems, as the Mosque of Omar then

---

tinued and wholehearted Russian participation in the war. British policy from the end of the Napoleonic wars had been directed against Russia's efforts to extend its conquests to the Golden Horn and the Mediterranean (threatening Egypt and the way to India). For this reason, Britain and France had formed an alliance and fought the Crimean War (1854-56), which ended in the Black Sea being declared neutral; no warships could enter it nor could arsenals be built on its shores.

But Russian concern for the capture of Constantinople was more than economic and strategic. It was not unusual for priests to declare that the Russian people had a sacred duty to drive out the "infidel" Turk and raise the orthodox cross on the dome of Santa Sophia.

In 1877, the Russian armies again moved towards Constantinople with the excuse of avenging cruelties practiced on Christians. Again England frustrated these designs and the aggression ended with the Congress of Berlin, and British occupation of Cyprus.

*Sir Mark Sykes, Secretary of the British War Cabinet, sent to Russia to negotiate the Tripartite (Sykes-Picot) Agreement for the Partition of the Ottoman Empire. M. Picot was the French representative in the negotiabecomes the only matter of vital importance to discuss with them and further does away with any contact with the bedouins, who never cross the river except on business. I imagine that the principal object of Zionism is the realization of the ideal of an existing center of nationality rather than boundaries or extent of territory. The moment I return I will let you know how things stand at Pd."[43]

However, in conversations both with Sykes and the French ambassador, Sazonov was careful not to commit himself as to the extent of the Russian interest in Palestine, but made it clear that Russia would have to insist that not only the holy places, but all towns and localities in which there were religious establishments belonging to the Orthodox Church, should be placed under international administration, with a guarantee for free access to the Mediterranean.[44]

Czarist Russia would not agree to a Zionist formula for Palestine; but its days were numbered.

The Third Pledge

In 1914, the central office of the Zionist Organization and the seat of its directorate, the Zionist Executive, were in Berlin. It already had adherents in most Eastern Jewish communities, including all the countries at war, though its main strength was in Russia and Austria-Hungary.[45] Some important institutions, namely, the Jewish Colonial Trust, the Anglo-Palestine Company and the Jewish National Fund, were incorporated in England. Of the Executive, two members (Otto Warburg* and Arthur Hantke) were German citizens, three (Yechiel Tschlenow, Nahum Sokolow and Victor Jacobson) were Russians and one (Shmarya Levin) had recently exchanged his Russian for Austro-Hungarian nationality. The 25 members of the General Council included 12 from Germany and Austria-Hungary, 7 from Russia, 2 (Chaim Weizmann and Leopold Kessler) from England, and one each from Belgium, France, Holland and Rumania.[46]

Some prominent German Zionists associated themselves with a newly founded organization known as the *Komitee fur den Osten*, whose aims were: "To place at the disposal of the German Govern-

---

tions. Neither Hussein nor Sir Henry McMahon were made aware of these secret discussions. Among other things, the agreement called for parts of Palestine to be placed under "an international administration."

*Of the Warburg international banking family. Although ostensibly a second Secretary in the Wilhelmstrasse, Warburg has been reported as having the same position in German counterintelligence as Admiral Canaris in World War II.

ment the special knowledge of the founders and their relations with the Jews in Eastern Europe and in America, so as to contribute to the overthrow of Czarist Russia and to secure the national autonomy of the Jews."[47]

Influential Zionists outside the Central Powers were disturbed by the activities of the K.f.d.O. and anxious for the Zionist movement not to be compromised. Weizmann's advice was that the central office be moved from Berlin and that the conduct of Zionist affairs during the war should be entrusted to a provisional executive committee for general Zionist affairs in the United States.

At a conference in New York on 30 August 1914, this committee was set up under the chairmanship of Louis D. Brandeis, with the British-born Dr. Richard Gottheil and Jacob de Haas, Rabbi Stephen Wise and Felix Frankfurter, among his principal lieutenants. For Shmarya Levin, the representative of the Zionist Executive in the United States, and Dr. Judah Magnes, to whom the alliance of England and France with Russia seemed "unholy," Russian czarism was the enemy against which their force should be pitted.[48] But on 1 October 1914 Gottheil, first President of the Zionist Organization of America, wrote from the Department of Semitic Languages, Columbia University, to Brandeis in Boston enclosing a memorandum on what the organization planned to seek from the belligerents, with respect to the Russian Jews:

> We have got to be prepared to work under the Government of any one of the Powers . . . I shall be glad to have any suggestion from you in regard to this memorandum, and shall be glad to know if it meets with your approval. I recognize that I ought not to have put it out without first consulting you; but the exigencies of the situation demanded immediate action. We ought to be fully prepared to take advantage of any occasion that offers itself.[49]

In a speech on 9 November, four days after Britain's declaration of war on Turkey, Prime Minister Asquith said that the traditional eastern policy had been abandoned and the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire had become a war aim. "It is the Ottoman Government," he declared, "and not we who have rung the death-knell of Ottoman dominion not only in Europe but in Asia."[50] The statement followed a discussion of the subject at a Cabinet meeting earlier that day, at which we know, from Herbert Samuel's memoirs, that Lloyd George, who had been retained as legal counsel by the Zionists some years before,[51] "referred to the ultimate destiny of Palestine." In a talk with Samuel after the meeting, Lloyd George assured him that "he was very keen to see a Jewish state established in Palestine."

On the same day, Samuel developed the Zionist position more fully in a conversation with the Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Grey. He spoke of Zionist aspirations for the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish state, and of the importance of its geographical position to the British Empire. Such a state, he said, "could not be large enough to defend itself," and it would therefore be essential that it should be, by constitution, neutral. Grey asked whether Syria as a whole must necessarily go with Palestine, and Samuel replied that this was not only unnecessary but inadvisable, since it would bring in a large and unassimilable Arab population. "It would," he said, "be a great advantage if the remainder of Syria were annexed by France, as it would be far better for the state to have a European Power as a neighbor than the Turk."[52]

In January 1915 Samuel produced a Zionist memorandum on Palestine after discussions with Weizmann and Lloyd George. It contained arguments in favor of combining British annexation of Palestine with British support for Zionist aspirations, and ended with objections to any other solution.[53] Samuel circulated it to his colleagues in the Cabinet. Lloyd George was already a Zionist "partisan"; Lord Haldane, to whom Weizmann had had access, wrote expressing a friendly interest;[54] though privately expressing Zionist sympathies, the Marquess of Crewe presumably did not express any views in the Cabinet on the memorandum;[55] Zionism had a strong sentimental attraction for Grey;[56] but his other colleagues, including his cousin Edwin Montagu, did not give him much encouragement. Prime Minister Asquith wrote: "I confess that I am not attracted by the proposed addition to our responsibilities, but it is a curious illustration of Dissy's favorite maxim that race is everything to find this almost lyrical outburst proceeding from the well-ordered and methodical brain of H.S."[57]

After further conversations with Lloyd George and Grey,[58] Samuel circulated a revised text to the Cabinet in the middle of March 1915.

It is not known if the memorandum was formally considered by the Cabinet, but Asquith wrote in his diary on 13 March 1915 of Samuel's "dithyrambic memorandum" of which Lloyd George was "the only other partisan."[59] Certainly, at this time, Zionist claims and aspirations were secondary to British policy towards Russia and the Arabs.

Britain, France and Germany attached considerable importance to the attitudes of Jewry towards them because money and credit were needed for the war. The international banking houses of Lazard Frères, Eugene Mayer, J. & W. Seligman, Speyer Brothers and M.M. Warburg, were all conducting major operations in the United States, as were the Rothschilds through the New York banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co.* Apart from their goodwill, the votes of America's Jewish community of 3,000,000 were important to the issue of that country's intervention or non-intervention in the war, and the provision of military supplies. The great majority represented the one-third of the Jews of Eastern Europe, including Russia, who had left their homelands and come to America between 1880 and 1914. Many detested Czarist Russia and wished to see it destroyed. Of these Jews, not more than 12,000 were enrolled members of the Zionist Organization.[60]

The goodwill of Jewry, and especially America's Jews, was assessed by both sides in the war as being very important. The once-poor Eastern European Jews had achieved a dominant position in New York's garment industry, and had become a significant political force. In 1914 they sent a Russian-born socialist to the Congress of the United States. They produced dozens of Yiddish periodicals; they patronized numerous Yiddish theatres and music halls; their sons and daughters were filling the metropolitan colleges and universities.[61]

From the beginning of the war, the German Ambassador in Washington, Count Bernstorff, was provided, by the *Komitee fuer den Osten,* with an adviser on Jewish Affairs (Isaac Straus); and when the head of the Zionist Agency in Constantinople appealed, in the winter of 1914, to the German Embassy to do what it could to relieve the pressure on the Jews in Palestine, it was reinforced by a similar appeal to Berlin from Bernstorff.[62] In November 1914, therefore, the German Embassy in Constantinople received instructions to recommend that the Turks sanction the re-opening of the Anglo-Palestine Company's Bank—a key Zionist institution. In December the Embassy made representations which prevented a projected mass deportation of Jews of Russian nationality.[63] In February 1915 German influence helped to save a number of Jews in Palestine from imprisonment or expulsion, and "a dozen or twenty times" the Germans intervened with the Turks at the re-

---

*Jacob Schiff, German-born senior partner in Kuhn, Loeb & Co. and "the most influential figure of his day in American Jewish life," wrote in *The Menorah Journal* of April 1915: "It is well known that I am a German sympathizer . . . England has been contaminated by her alliance with Russia . . . I am quite convinced that in Germany anti-semitism is a thing of the past.[64] The *Jewish Encyclopedia* for 1906 states that "Schiff's firm subscribed for and floated the large Japanese war loan in 1904-05" (for the Russo-Japanese war), "in recognition of which the Mikado conferred on Schiff the second order of the Sacred Treasure of Japan."

Partners with Schiff were Felix M. Warburg and his brother Paul who had come to New York in 1902 from Hamburg, and organized the Federal Reserve System.

quest of the Zionist office in Turkey, "thus saving and protecting the *Yishuv*."[65] The German representations reinforced those of the American Ambassador in Turkey (Henry Morgenthau).*[66] Moreover, both the German consulates in Palestine and the head of the German military mission there frequently exerted their influence on behalf of the Jews.[67]

German respect for Jewish goodwill enabled the Constantinople Zionist Agency from December 1914 to use the German diplomatic courier service and telegraphic code for communicating with Berlin and Palestine.[68] On 5 June 1915 Victor Jacobson was received at the German Foreign Office by the Under-Secretary of State (von Zimmerman) and regular contact commenced between the Berlin Zionist Executive (Warburg, Hantke and Jacobson) and the German Foreign Office.[69]

Zionist propagandists in Germany elaborated and publicized the idea that Turkey could become a German satellite and its Empire in Asia made wide open to German enterprise; support for "a revival of Jewish life in Palestine" would form a bastion of German influence in that part of the world.[70] This was followed by solicitation of the German Foreign Office to notify the German consuls in Palestine of the German Government's friendly interest in Zionism. Such a course was favored by von Neurath** when asked by Berlin for his views in October, and in November of 1915, the text for such a document was agreed upon and circulated after the approval of the German Chancellor (Bethmann-Hollweg). It was cautiously and vaguely worded so as not to upset Turkish susceptibilities, stating to the Palestine consuls that the German Government looked favorably on "Jewish activities designed to promote the economic and cultural progress of the Jews in Turkey, and also on the immigration and settlement of Jews from other countries."[71]

The Zionists felt that an important advance toward a firm German commitment to their aims had been made, but when the Berlin Zionist Executive pressed for a public assurance of sympathy and support, the Government told them to wait until the end of the war, when a victorious Germany would demonstrate its goodwill.[72]

When Zionist leaders in Germany met Jemal Pasha, by arrangement with the Foreign Office, during his visit to Berlin in the summer of 1917, they were told that the existing Jewish population would be treated fairly but that no further Jewish immigrants would be allowed. Jews could settle anywhere else but not in

---

*An award for Morgenthau's heavy financial support for Wilson's presidential campaign.

**Later, Foreign Minister (1932-38) and Protector of Bohemia (1939-43).

Palestine. The Turkish Government, Jemal Pasha declared, wanted no new nationality problems, nor was it prepared to antagonize the Palestinian Arabs, "who formed the majority of the population and were to a man opposed to Zionism."[73]

A few weeks after the interview, the Berlin Zionists' pressure was further weakened by the uncovering by Turkish Intelligence of a Zionist spy ring working for General Allenby's Intelligence section under an Aaron Aaronssohn. "It is no wonder that the Germans, tempted as they may have been by its advantages, shrank from committing themselves to a pro-Zionist declaration."[74]

It was fortunate for Zionism that the American Jews as a whole showed no enthusiasm for the Allied cause, wrote Stein, political secretary of the Zionist Organization from 1920 to 1929, "If they had all along been reliable friends, there would have been no need to pay them any special attention."[75]

In 1914 the French Government had sponsored a visit to the United States by Professor Sylvain Levy and the Grand Rabbi of France with the object of influencing Jewish opinion in their favor, but without success. A year later, it tried to reply to disturbing reports from its embassy in Washington about the sympathies of American Jews[76] by sending a Jew of Hungarian origin (Professor Victor Basch) to the United States in November 1915.[77] Ostensibly he represented the Ministry of Public Instruction, but his real mission was to influence American Jews through contact with their leaders.[78] Though armed with a message to American Jewry from Prime Minister Briand, he encountered an insuperable obstacle—the Russian alliance. "For Russia there is universal hatred and distrust . . . We are reproached with one thing only, the persecution of the Russian Jews, which we tolerate—a toleration which makes us accomplices . . . It is certain that any measures in favor of Jewish emancipation would be equivalent to a great battle lost by Germany."[79] Basch had to report to French President Poincare the failure of his mission.[80]

At the same time that Basch had been dispatched to the United States, the French Government approved the setting up of a "Comité de Propagande Francais aupres des Juifs neutres," and Jacques Bigart, the Secretary of the Alliance Israelite, accepted a secretaryship of the Comite. Bigart suggested to Lucien Wolf, of the Jewish Conjoint Foreign Committee in London, that a similar committee be set up there. Wolf consulted the Foreign Office and was invited by Lord Robert Cecil to provide a full statement of his views.[81]

In December 1915 Wolf submitted a memorandum in which he analyzed the characteristics of the Jewish population of the United States and reached the conclusion that "the situation, though unsatisfactory, is far from unpromising." Though disclaiming Zionism, he wrote that "In America, the Zionist organizations have lately captured Jewish opinion." If a statement of sympathy with their aspirations were made, "I am confident they would sweep the whole of American Jewry into enthusiastic allegiance to their cause."[82]

Early in 1916 a further memorandum was submitted to the British Foreign Office as a formal communication from the Jewish Conjoint Foreign Committee. This stated that "the London (Conjoint) and Paris Committees formed to influence Jewish opinion in neutral countries in a sense favorable to the Allies" had agreed to make representations to their respective Governments. First, the Russian Government should be urged to ease the position of their Jews by immediate concessions for national-cultural autonomy; secondly, "in view of the great organized strength of the Zionists in the United States," (in fact out of the three million Jews in the U.S. less than 12,000 had enrolled as Zionists in 1913),[83] the Allied Powers should give assurances to the Jews of facilities in Palestine for immigration and colonization, liberal local self-government for Jewish colonists, the establishment of a Jewish university, and for the recognition of Hebrew as one of the vernaculars of the land—in the event of their victory.[84]

On 9 March 1916 the Zionists were informed by the Foreign Office that "your suggested formula is receiving (Sir Edward Grey's) careful and sympathetic attention, but it is necessary for H.M.G. to consult their Allies on the subject."[85] A confidential memorandum was accordingly addressed to the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs in Petrograd, to ascertain his views, though its paternity, seeing that Asquith was still Prime Minister, "remains to be discovered."[86] No direct reply was received, but in a note addressed to the British and French ambassadors four days later, Sazonov obliquely assented, subject to guarantees for the Orthodox Church and its establishments, to raise no objection to the settlement of Jewish colonists in Palestine.[87]

Nothing came of these proposals. On 4 July the Foreign Office informed the Conjoint Committee that an official announcement of support was inopportune.[88] They must be considered alongside the Sykes-Picot Agreement being negotiated at this time, and the virtual completion of the Hussein-McMahon Correspondence by 10 March 1916, with the hope that an Arab revolt and other measures would bring victory near.

But 1916 was a disastrous year for the Allies. "In the story of the war" wrote Lloyd George,

> the end of 1916 found the fortunes of the Allies at their lowest ebb. In the offensives on the western front we had lost three men for every two of the Germans we had put out of action. Over 300,000

> British troops were being immobilized for lack of initiative or equipment or both by the Turks in Egypt and Mesopotamia, and for the same reason nearly 400,000 Allied soldiers were for all purposes interned in the malarial plains around Salonika.[89]

The voluntary system of enlistment was abolished, and a mass conscript army of continental pattern was adopted, something which had never before occurred in British history.*[90] German submarine activity in the Atlantic was formidable; nearly 1½ million tons of merchant shipping had been sunk in 1916 alone. As for paying for the war, the Allies at first had used the huge American debts in Europe to pay for war supplies, but by 1916 the resources of J.P. Morgan and Company, the Allies' financial and purchasing agents in the United States, were said to be nearly exhausted by increased Allied demands for American credit.[91] There was rebellion in Ireland. Lord Robert Cecil stated to the British Cabinet: "France is within measurable distance of exhaustion. The political outlook of Italy is menacing. Her finance is tottering. In Russia, there is great discouragement. She has long been on the verge of revolution. Even her man-power seems coming near its limits."[94]

Secretary of State Kitchener was gone—drowned when the cruiser *Hampshire* sank on 5 June 1916 off the Orkneys when he was on his way to Archangel and Petrograd to nip the revolution in the bud. He had a better knowledge of the Middle East than anyone else in the Cabinet. The circumstances suggest espionage and treachery. Walter Page, the U.S. Ambassador in London, entered in his diary: "There was a hope and feeling that he (Lord Kitchener) might not come back . . . as I make out."

There was a stalemate on all fronts. In Britain, France and Germany, hardly a family numbered all its sons among the living. But the British public—and the French, and the German—were not allowed to know the numbers of the dead and wounded. By restricting war correspondents, the American people were not allowed to know the truth either.

---

*Russian nationals resident in the United Kingdom (nearly all of them Jews), not having become British subjects, some 25,000 of military age, still escaped military service.[92] This prompted Jabotinsky and Weizmann to urge the formation of a special brigade for Russian Jews, but the idea was not favorably received by the Government, and the Zionists joined non-Zionists in an effort to persuade Russian Jews of military age to volunteer as individuals for service in the British army. The response was negligible, and in July 1917 the Military Service (Conventions with Allies) Act was given Royal assent. Men of military age were invited to serve in the British army or risk deportation to Russia. However, the Russian revolution prevented its unhindered application.[93]

The figures that are known are a recital of horrors.*

In these circumstances, a European tradition of negotiated peace in scores of wars, might have led to peace at the end of 1916 or early 1917.

Into this gloomy winter of 1916 walked a new figure. He was James Malcolm,** an Oxford educated Armenian*** who, at the beginning of 1916, with the sanction of the British and Russian Governments, had been appointed by the Armenian Patriarch a member of the Armenian National Delegation to take charge of Armenian interests during and after the war. In this official capacity, and as adviser to the British Government on Eastern affairs,[95] he had frequent contacts with the Cabinet Office, the Foreign Office, the War Office and the French and other Allied embassies in London, and made visits to Paris for consultations with his colleagues and leading French officials. He was passionately devoted to an Allied victory which he hoped would guarantee the national freedom of the Armenians then under Turkish and Russian rule.

Sir Mark Sykes, with whom he was on terms of family friendship, told him that the Cabinet was looking anxiously for United States intervention in the war on the side of the Allies, but when asked what progress was being made in that direction, Sykes shook his head glumly. "Precious little," he replied.

James Malcolm now suggested to Mark Sykes that the reason why previous overtures to American Jewry to support the Allies had received no attention was because the approach had been made to the wrong people. It was to the Zionist Jews that the British and French Governments should address their parleys.

"You are going the wrong way about it," said Mr. Malcolm. "You can win the sympathy of certain politically-minded Jews

---

*Half a million Frenchmen were lost in the first four months of war, 1 million lost by the end of 1915, and 5 million by 1918. Who can imagine that the Allies lost 600,000 men in one battle, the Somme, and the British more officers in the first few months than all wars of the previous hundred years put together?

At Stalingrad, in the Second World War, the Wehrmacht had 230,000 men in the field. The German *losses* at Verdun alone were 325,000 killed or wounded.

By this time a soldier in one of the better divisions could count on a maximum of three months' service without being killed or wounded, and the life expectancy for an officer at the front was down to five months in an ordinary regiment and six weeks in a crack one.

**See his *Origins of the Balfour Declaration: Dr. Weizmann's Contribution* reprinted by the IHR, $2.00 postpaid.

***Born in Persia, where his family had settled before Elizabethan days. He was sent to school in England in 1881, being placed in the care of a everywhere, and especially in the United States, in one way only, and that is, by offering to try and secure Palestine for them."[96]

What really weighed most heavily now with Sykes were the terms of the secret Sykes-Picot Agreement. He told Malcolm that to offer to secure Palestine for the Jews was impossible. "Malcolm insisted that there was no other way and urged a Cabinet discussion. A day or two later, Sykes told him that the matter had been mentioned to Lord Milner who had asked for further information. Malcolm pointed out the influence of Judge Brandeis of the American Supreme Court, and his strong Zionist sympathies."[97]

In the United States, the President's adviser, Louis D. Brandeis, a leading advocate of Zionism, had been inducted as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court on 5 June 1916. That Wilson was vulnerable was evident, in that as early as 1911, he had made known his profound interest in the Zionist idea and in Jewry.[98]

Malcolm described Wilson as being "attached to Brandeis by ties of peculiar hardness," a cryptic reference to the story that Wilson had been blackmailed for $40,000 for some hot love letters he had written to his neighbor's wife when he was President of Princeton. He did not have the money, and the go-between, Samuel Untermeyer, of the law firm of Guggenheim, Untermeyer & Marshall, said he would provide it if Wilson would appoint to the next vacancy on the Supreme Court a nominee selected by Mr. Untermeyer. The money was paid, the letters returned, and Brandeis had been the nominee.

Wilson had written to the Senate, where opposition to the nominee was strong: "I have known him. I have tested him by seeking his advice upon some of the most difficult and perplexing public questions about which it was necessary for me to form a judgement . . ." When Brandeis had been approved by the Senate, Wilson wrote to Henry Morgenthau: "I never signed any commission with such satisfaction." "Relief" might have been a more appropriate word.

The fact that endorsement of Wilson's nominee by the Senate Judiciary Committee had only been made "after hearings of unprecedented length"[99] was not important. Brandeis had the President's ear; he was "formally concerned with the Department of State."[100] This was the significant development, said Malcolm, which compelled a new approach to the Zionists by offering them the key to Palestine.

The British Ambassador to the United States (Sir Cecil Spring-

---

friend and agent of his family, Sir Albert (Abdullah) Sassoon. Early in 1915, he founded the Russia Society in London among the British public as a means of improving relations between the two countries. Unlike the Zionists, he had no animus towards Czarist Russia.

Rice) had written from Washington in January 1914 that "a deputation came down from New York and in two days 'fixed' the two Houses so that the President had to renounce the idea of making a new treaty with Russia."[101] In November 1914 he had written to the British Foreign Secretary of the German Jewish bankers who were extending credits to the German Government and "were getting hold of the principal New York papers" thereby "bringing them over as much as they dare to the German side" and "toiling in a solid phalanx to compass our destruction."[102]

This anti-Russian sentiment was part of a deep concern for the well-being of Russian and Polish Jews. Brandeis wrote to his brother from Washington on 8 December 1914: ". . . You cannot possibly conceive the horrible sufferings of the Jews in Poland and adjacent countries. These changes of control from German to Russian and Polish anti-semitism are bringing miseries as great as the Jews ever suffered in all their exiles."*[103]

In a speech to the Russian Duma on 9 February (27 January Gregorian) 1915, Foreign Minister Sazonov denied the calumnious stories which, he said, were circulated by Germany, of accounts of alleged pogroms against the Jews and of wholesale murders of Jews by the Russian armies. "If the Jewish population suffered in the war zone, that circumstance unfortunately was inevitably associated with war, and the same conditions applied in equal measure to all people living within the region of military activity." He added to the rebuttal with accounts of hardship in areas of German military action in Poland, Belgium and Serbia.[104]

It is noteworthy that the chairman of the non-Zionist American Jewish Committee responded to an appeal by the Brandeis group that all American Jews should organize to emphasize Zionist aims in Palestine before the Great Powers in any negotiations during or at the end of the war, by dissociating his community from the suggestion that Jews of other nationalities were to be accorded special status. He said that "the very thought of the mass of the Jews of America having a voice in the matter of deciding the welfare of the Jews in the world made him shrink in horror."[107]

The new approach to the Zionist movement by Mark Sykes with James Malcolm as preliminary interlocutor took the form of a series of meetings at Chaim Weizmann's London house, with the knowledge and approval of the Secretary of the War Cabinet, Sir Maurice Hankey.

---

*A reference to the 1914 invasion of Austria and East Prussia by the Russians with such vigor that many people believed that the "Russian steamroller" would soon reach Berlin and end the war. Only the diversion of whole army divisions from the Western to the Eastern Front under the command of General von Hindenburg saved Berlin, and in turn saved Paris.

There was a direct effort by certain groups to support anti-Imperial activities in Russia from the United States,[105] but Brandeis was apparently not implicated.

A Programme for a New Administration of Palestine in Accordance with the Aspirations of the Zionist Movement was issued by the English Political Committee of the Zionist Organization in October 1916, and submitted to the British Foreign Office as a basis for discussion in order to give an official character to the informal house-talks. It included the following:

> (1) The Jewish Chartered Company is to have power to exercise the right of pre-emption over Crown and other lands and to acquire for its own use all or any concessions which may at any time be granted by the suzerain government or governments.
>
> (2) The present population, being too small, too poor and too little trained to make rapid progress, requires the introduction of a new and progressive element in the population. (But the rights of minority nationalities were to be protected).

Other points were, (3) recognition of separate Jewish nationality in Palestine; (4) participation of the Palestine Jewish population in local self-government; (5) Jewish autonomy in purely Jewish affairs; (6) official recognition and legalization of existing Jewish institutions for colonization in Palestine.[108]

This *Programme* does not appear to have reached Cabinet level at the time it was issued, probably because of Asquith's known lack of sympathy, but as recorded by Samuel Landman, the Zionist Organization was given official British facilities for its international correspondence.[109]

Lloyd George, an earnest and powerful demagogue, was now prepared to oust Asquith, his chief, by a *coup de main*. With the death of Kitchener in the summer of 1916, he had passed from Munitions to the War Office and he saw the top of the parliamentary tree within his grasp. In this manuever he was powerfully aided by the newspaper proprietor Northcliffe,* who turned all his publications from *The Times* downwards to depreciate Asquith, and by the newspaper-owing M.P., Max Aitken (later Lord Beaverbrook).

With public sympathy well prepared, Lloyd George demanded virtual control of war policy. It was intended that Asquith should refuse. He did. Lloyd George resigned. Asquith also resigned to facilitate the reconstruction of the Government. The King then sent for the Conservative leader, Bonar Law, who, as prearranged, advised him to offer the premiership to Lloyd George.[110]

---

*Northcliffe was small-minded enough to have Lloyd George called to the telephone, in front of friends, to demonstrate the politician's need of the Press.

Asquith and Grey were out; Lloyd George and Balfour were in. With Lloyd George as Prime Minister from December 1916, Zionist relations with the British Government developed fast. Lloyd George had been legal counsel for the Zionists, and while Minister of Munitions, had had assistance from the Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann; the new Foreign Minister, Arthur Balfour, was already known for his Zionist sympathies.

The Zionists were undermining the wall between them and their Palestine objective which they had found impossible "to surmount by ordinary political means" prior to the war.[111] Herzl's suggestion that they would get Palestine "not from the goodwill but from the jealousy of the Powers,"[112] was being made to come true.

The Zionists moved resolutely to exploit the new situation now that the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary were their firm supporters.

Landman, in his *Secret History of the Balfour Declaration*, wrote:

> Through General McDonogh, Director of Military Operations, who was won over by Fitzmaurice (formerly Dragoman of the British Embassy in Constantinople and a friend of James Malcolm), Dr. Weizmann was able, about this time, to secure from the Government the services of half a dozen younger Zionists for active work on behalf of Zionism. At the time, conscription was in force, and only those who were engaged on work of national importance could be released from active service at the Front. I remember Dr. Weizmann writing a letter to General McDonogh and invoking his assistance in obtaining the exemption from active service of Leon Simon, (who later rose to high rank in the Civil Service as Sir Leon Simon, C.B.), Harry Sacher, (on the editorial staff of the Manchester Guardian), Simon Marks,* Yamson Tolkowsky and myself. At Dr. Weizmann's request I was transferred from the War Office (M.I.9), where I was then working, to the Ministry of Propaganda, which was under Lord Northcliffe, and later to the Zionist office, where I commenced work about December 1916. Simon Marks actually arrived at the Office in khaki, and immediately set about the task of organizing the office which, as will be easily understood, had to maintain constant communications with Zionists in most countries.
>
> From that time onwards for several years, Zionism was considered an ally of the British Government, and every help and assistance was forthcoming from each government department. Passport or travel difficulties did not exist when a man was recommended by our office. For instance, a certificate signed by me was

---

*Associated with Israel M. Sieff, another of Weizmann's inner circle, in the business which later became Marks & Spencer, Ltd. Sieff was appointed an economic consultant to the U.S. Administration (OPA) in March 1924. As subsequent supporters, with Lord Melchett, of "Political and Economic Planning" (PEP), they exercised considerable influence on British inter-war policy.

accepted by the Home Office at that time as evidence that an Ottoman Jew was to be treated as a friendly alien and not as an enemy, which was the case with the Turkish subjects.

The Declaration, 1917

The informal committee of Zionists and Mark Sykes as representative of the British Government, met on 7 February 1917 at the house of Moses Gaster,* the Chief Rabbi of the Sephardic (Spanish and Portuguese) congregations in England. Gaster opened the meeting with a statement that stressed Zionist support for British strategic interests in Palestine which were to be an integral part of any agreement between them. As these interests might be considered paramount to British statesmen, support for Zionist aims there, Gaster said, was fully justified. Zionism was irrevocably opposed to any internationalization proposals, even an Anglo-French condominium.[113]

Herbert Samuel followed with an expression of the hope that Jews in Palestine would receive full national status, which would be shared by Jews in the *Diaspora*. The question of conflict of nationality was not mentioned and a succeeding speaker, Harry Sacher, suggested that the sharing should not involve the political implications of citizenship.[114] Weizmann spoke of the necessity for unrestricted immigration. It is clear that the content of each speech was thoroughly prepared before the meeting.

Sykes outlined the obstacles: the inevitable Russian objections, the opposition of the Arabs, and strongly pressed French claims to all Syria, including Palestine.[115] James de Rothschild and Nahum Sokolow, the international Zionist leader, also spoke.

The meeting ended with a summary of Zionist objectives:

I. International recognition of Jewish right to Palestine;
II. Juridical nationhood for the Jewish community in Palestine;
III. The creation of a Jewish chartered company in Palestine with rights to acquire land;
IV. Union and one administration for Palestine; and
V. Extra-territorial status for the holy places.[117]

The first three points are Zionist, the last two were designed to placate England and Russia, respectively,[118] and probably Italy and the Vatican. Sokolow was chosen to act as Zionist representative, to negotiate with Sir Mark Sykes.

---

*Born in Rumania in 1856, his imposing presence and scholarship combined with "an oracular manner suggesting that he had access to mysteries hidden from others, had made him an important figure at Zionist Congresses and on Zionist platforms in England and abroad." It was calculated that Sykes would be impressed by his personality and background.[116]

The Zionists were, of course, coordinating their activities internationally. On the same day as the meeting in London, Rabbi Stephen Wise in the United States wrote to Brandeis: "I sent the memorandum to Colonel House covering our question, and he writes: 'I hope the dream you have may soon become a reality.' "[118a]

The reports reaching England of impending dissolution of the Russian state practically removed the need for Russian endorsement of Zionist aims, but made French and Italian acceptance even more urgent. This at any rate was the belief of Sykes, Balfour, Lloyd George and Winston Churchill, who, as claimed in their subsequent statements, were convinced that proclaimed Allied support for Zionist aims would especially influence the United States. Events in Russia made the cooperation of Jewish groups with the Allies much easier. At a mass meeting in March 1917 to celebrate the revolution which had then taken place, Rabbi Stephen Wise, who had succeeded Brandeis as chairman of the American Provisional Zionist Committee after Brandeis's appointment to the Supreme Court, said: "I believe that of all the achievements of my people, none has been nobler than the part the sons and daughters of Israel have taken in the great movement which has culminated in free Russia."[119]

Negotiations for a series of loans totalling $190,000,000 by the United States to the Provisional Government in Russia of Alexander Kerensky were begun on the advice of the U.S. ambassador to Russia, David R. Francis, who noted in his telegram to Secretary of State Lansing, "financial aid now from America would be a master-stroke. Confidential. Immeasurably important to the Jews that revolution succeed . . ."[120]

On 22 March 1917 Jacob H. Schiff of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., wrote to Mortimer Schiff, "We should be somewhat careful not to appear as overzealous but you might cable Cassel because of recent action of Germany (the declaration of unlimited U-boat warfare) and developments in Russia we shall no longer abstain from Allied Governments financing when opportunity offers."

He also sent a congratulatory cable to the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the first Provisional Government, referring to the previous government as "the merciless persecutors of my coreligionists."

In the same month, Leiber Davidovich Bronstein, alias Leon Trotsky, a Russian-born U.S. immigrant, had left the Bronx, New York, for Russia, with a contingent of followers, while V.I. Ulyanov (Lenin) and a party of about thirty were moving across Germany from Switzerland, through Scandinavia to Russia. Some evidence exists that Schiff and other sponsors like Helphand financed these revolutionaries.

In March 1917, President Wilson denounced as "a little group of willful men," the non-interventionists who filibustered an Administration-sponsored bill that would have empowered Wilson to wage an undeclared naval war against Germany. The opposition to Wilson was led by Senators La Follette and Norris.

On 5 April, the day before the United States Congress adopted a resolution of war, Schiff had been informed by Baron Gunzburg of the actual signing of the decrees removing all restrictions on the Jews in Russia.

At a special session of Congress on 2 April 1917, President Wilson referred to American merchant ships taking supplies to the Allies which had been sunk during the previous month by German submarines (operating a counter-blockade; the British and French fleets having blockaded the Central Powers from the beginning of the war); and then told Congress that "wonderful and heartening things have been happening within the last few weeks in Russia."

He asked for a declaration of war with a mission:

> for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, *for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free.*
>
> To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace that she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other. (emphasis supplied)

That night crowds filled the streets, marching, shouting, singing "Dixie" or "The Star Spangled Banner." Wilson turned to his secretary, Tumulty: "Think what that means, the applause. My message tonight was a message of death. How strange to applaud that!"

So, within six months of Malcolm's specific suggestion to Sykes, the United States of America, guided by Woodrow Wilson, was on the side of the Allies in the Great War.

Was Wilson guided by Brandeis away from neutrality—to war?

In London, the War Cabinet led by Lloyd George lost no time committing British forces first to the capture of Jerusalem, and then to the total expulsion of the Turks from Palestine. The attack from Egypt, launched on 26 March 1917, attempting to take Gaza, ended in failure. By the end of April a second attack on Gaza had been driven back and it had become clear that there was no prospect of a quick success on this Front.

From Cairo, where he had gone hoping to follow the Army into Jerusalem with Weizmann, Sykes telegraphed to the Foreign Office that, if the Egyptian Expeditionary Force was not reinforced, then it would be necessary "to drop all Zionist projects . . . Zionists in London and U.S.A. should be warned of this through M. Sokolow . . ."[120a]

Three weeks later, Sykes was told that reinforcements were coming from Salonika. The War Cabinet also decided to replace the Force's commander with General Allenby.

Sykes was the official negotiator for the whole project of assisting the Zionists. He acted immediately after the meeting at Gaster's house by asking his friend M. Picot to meet Nahum Sokolow at the French Embassy in London in an attempt to induce the French to give way on the question of British suzerainty in Palestine.[121] James Malcolm was then asked to go alone to Paris to arrange an interview for Sokolow directly with the French Foreign Minister. Sokolow had been previously unsuccessful in obtaining the support of French Jewry for a meeting with the Minister; since the richest and most influential Jews in the United States and England, with the notable exception of the Rothschilds, who could have arranged such a meeting, were opposed to the political implications of Zionism. In Paris, the powerful *Alliance Israélite Universelle* had made every effort to dissuade him from his mission.[122] Not that the Zionists had no supporters in France other than Edmond de Rothschild,* but the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had no reason to entangle itself with them.[123] Now James Malcolm opened the door directly to them as he had done in London.

Sykes joined Malcolm and Sokolow in Paris. Sykes and Malcolm, apart from the consideration of Zionism and future American support for the war, were concerned with the possibility of an Arab-Jewish-Armenian *entente* which, through amity between Islamic, Jewish and Christian peoples, would bring peace, stability and a bright new future for the inhabitants of this area where Europe, Asia Minor and Africa meet. Sokolow went along for the diplomatic ride, but in a letter to Weizmann (20 April 1917) he wrote: "I regard the idea as quite fantastic. It is difficult to reach an understanding with the Arabs, but we will have to try. There are no conflicts between Jews and Armenians because there are no common interests whatever."**[124]

---

*These included the socialist leader, Jules Guesde, who had joined Viviani's National Government as Minister of State; Gustave Herve; the publicist and future Minister de Monzie; and others.

**Privately, Sokolow resented Malcolm as "a stranger in the center of our work," who was "endowed with an *esprit* of a goyish kind."[130]

Several conversations were held with Picot, including one on 9 April when other officials included Jules Cambon, the Secretary-General of the Foreign Ministry, and the Minister's Chef de Cabinet. Exactly what assurances were given to Sokolow is uncertain, but he wrote to Weizmann "that they accept in principle the recognition of Jewish nationality in terms of a national home, local autonomy, etc."[125] And to Brandeis and Tschlenow, he telegraphed through French official channels: ". . . Have full confidence Allied victory will realise our Palestine Zionist aspirations."[126]

Sokolow set off for Rome and the Vatican. "There, thanks to the introductions of Fitzmaurice on the one hand and the help of Baron Sidney Sonnino* on the other," a Papal audience and interviews with the leading Foreign Office officials were quickly arranged.[127]

When Sokolow returned to Paris, he requested and received a letter from the Foreign Minister dated 4 June 1917, supporting the Zionist cause in general terms. He hastily wrote two telegrams which he gave to M. Picot for dispatch by official diplomatic channels. One was addressed to Louis D. Brandeis in the United States. It read: "Now you can move. We have the formal assurance of the French Government."**[128]

"After many years," wrote M. Picot, "I am still moved by the thanks he poured out to me as he gave me the two telegrams . . . I do not say that it was the cause of the great upsurge of enthusiasm which occurred in the United States, but I say that Judge Brandeis, to whom this telegram was addressed, was certainly one of the elements determining the decision of President Wilson."[129]

But Wilson had declared war one month before!

It is natural that M. Picot should want to believe that he had played a significant part in bringing America into the war and therefore helping his country's victory. The evidence certainly supports his having a part in helping a Zionist victory.

Their objective was in sight, but had still to be taken and held.

Although the United States was now a belligerent, no declaration of support had been made for the Zionist program for

---

*Of Jewish extraction.[131]

**The French note represented a defeat for the "Syrian Party" in the government who believed in French dominion over the entire area. This was not only due to the strong representations of Sykes on behalf of his Government, but was assisted by those of Baron Edmond de Rothschild,[132] who prevailed upon the *Alliance Israélite* to back the Zionist cause.

The result of the no less successful conversations in Rome and the Vatican were cabled to the Zionist Organization over British controlled lines.[133]

Palestine, either by Britain or the United States, and some of the richest and most powerful Jews in both countries were opposed to it.

The exception among these Jewish merchant princes was, of course, the House of Rothschild. From London on 25 April 1917, James de Rothschild cabled to Brandeis that Balfour was coming to the United States, and urged American Jewry to support "a Jewish Palestine under British protection," as well as to press their government to do so. He advised Brandeis to meet Balfour.[134] The meeting took place at a White House luncheon. "You are one of the Americans I wanted to meet," said the British Foreign Secretary.[135] Brandeis cabled Louis de Rothschild: "Have had a satisfactory talk with Mr. Balfour, also with our President. This is not for publication."[136]

On the other hand, a letter dated 17 May 1917 appeared in *The Times* (London) signed by the President of the Jewish Board of Deputies and the President of the Anglo-Jewish Association (Alexander and Montefiore, both men of wealth and eminence) stating their approval of Jewish settlement in Palestine as a source of inspiration for all Jews, but adding that they could not favor the Zionists' political scheme. Jews, they believed, were a religious community and they opposed the creation of "a secular Jewish nationality recruited on some loose and obscure principle of race and ethnological peculiarity." They particularly took exception to Zionist pressure for a Jewish chartered company invested with political and economic privileges in which Jews alone would participate, since this was incompatible with the desires of world Jewry for equal rights wherever they lived.[137]

A controversy then ensued in the British press, in Jewish associations and in the corridors of government, between the Zionist and non-Zionist Jews. In this, Weizmann really had less weight, but he mobilized the more forceful team. The Chief Rabbi dissociated himself from the non-Zionist statement and charged that the Alexander-Montefiore letter did not represent the views of their organizations.[138] Lord Rothschild wrote: "We Zionists cannot see how the establishment of an autonomous *Jewish State* under the aegis of one of the Allied Powers could be subersive to the loyalty of Jews to countries of which they were citizens. In the letter you have published, the question is also raised of a chartered company." He continued: "We Zionists have always felt that if Palestine is to be colonized by the Jews, some machinery must be set up to receive the immigrants, settle them on the land and develop the land, and to be generally a directing agency. I can only again emphasize that we Zionists have no wish for privileges at the expense of other nationalities, but only desire to be allowed to work out our destinies side by side with other nationalities in an autonomous state under the suzerainty of one of the Allied Powers."[139] This letter stressed the colonialist aspect of Zionism, but detracted from the strong statist declaration of Weizmann. The Zionist body in Palestine was to be of a more organizational character for the Jewish community.

Perhaps feeling that his statement had been a little too strong for liberal acceptance, Weizmann also joined this correspondence in the *Times*. Writing as President of the English Zionist Federation, he first claimed that,

> it is strictly a question of fact that the Jews are a nationality. An overwhelming majority of them had always had the conviction that they were a nationality, which has been shared by non-Jews in all countries."

The letter continued:

> The Zionists are not demanding in Palestine monopolies or exclusive privileges, nor are they asking that any part of Palestine should be administered by a chartered company to the detriment of others. *It always was and remains a cardinal principle of Zionism as a democratic movement that all races and sects in Palestine should enjoy full justice and liberty,* and Zionists are confident that the new suzerain whom they hope Palestine will acquire as a result of the war will, in its administration of the country, be guided by the same principle.[140] (emphasis supplied)

The competition for the attention of the British public and British Jewry by the Zionists and their Jewish opponents continued in the press and in their various special meetings. A manifesto of solidarity with the opinions of Alexander and Montefiore was sent to *The Times* on 1 June 1917; and in the same month at Buffalo, N.Y., the President of the Annual Convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis added his weight against Jewish nationalism: "I am not here to quarrel with Zionism. Mine is only the intention to declare that we, as rabbis, who are consecrated to the service of the Lord . . . have no place in a movement in which Jews band together on racial or national grounds, and for a political State or even for a legally-assured Home."[141]

But while the controversy continued, the Zionists worked hard to produce a draft document which could form a declaration acceptable to the Allies, particularly Britain and the United States, and which would be in the nature of a charter of international status for their aims in Palestine. This was treated as a matter of urgency, as Weizmann believed it would remove the support from non-Zionist Jews[142] and ensure against the uncertainties inseparable from the war.

On 13 June 1917 Weizmann wrote Sir Ronald Graham at the Foreign Office that "it appears desirable from every point of view that the British Government should give expression to its sympathy and support of the Zionist claims on Palestine. In fact, it need only confirm the view which eminent and representative members of the Government have many times expressed to us . . ."[143] This was timed to coincide with a minute of the same date of one of Balfour's advisers in which it was suggested that the time had arrived "when we might meet the wishes of the Zionists and give them an assurance that H.M.G. are in general sympathy with their aspirations."[144] To which Balfour remarked, "Personally, I should still prefer to associate the U.S.A. in the protectorate, should we succeed in securing it."[145]

The Zionists also had to counter tentative British and American plans to seek a separate peace with Turkey. When Weizmann, for the Zionists, together with Malcolm, for the Armenians, went on 10 June to the Foreign Office to protest such a plan, Weizmann broadly suggested that the Zionist leaders in Germany were being courted by the German Government, and he mentioned, to improve credibility, that approaches were made to them through the medium of a Dr. Lepsius.

The truth, probably, is that the Berlin Zionist Executive was initiating renewed contact with the German Government so as to give weight to the pleading of their counterparts in London that the risk of German competition could not be left out of account. Lepsius was actually a leading Evangelical divine, well known for his championship of the Armenians, who were then being massacred in Turkey. When Leonard Stein examined the papers of the Berlin Executive after the war, his name was not to be found, and Mr. Lichtheim of the Executive had no recollection of any overtures by Lepsius.[146]

In the U.S., in July 1917, a special mission consisting of Henry Morgenthau, Sr., and Justice Brandeis's nephew, Felix Frankfurter, was charged by President Wilson to proceed to Turkey, against which the United States did not declare war, to sound out the possibility of peace negotiations between Turkey and the Allies. In this, Wilson may have been particularly motivated by his passion to stop the massacres of Armenian and Greek Christians which were then taking place in Turkey and for whom he expressed immense solicitude on many occasions. Weizmann, however, accompanied by the French Zionist M. Weyl, forewarned, proceeded to intercept them at Gibraltar and persuaded them to return home.[147] During 1917 and 1918 more Christians were massacred in Turkey. Had Morgenthau and Frankfurter carried out their mission successfully, maybe this would have been avoided.

This account appears in William Yale's book *The Near East: A Modern History.* He was a Special Agent of the State Department in the Near East during the First World War. When I had dinner with him on 12 May 1970 at the Biltmore Hotel in New York, I asked him if Weizmann had told him how the special mission had been aborted. He replied that Weizmann said that the Governor of Gilbraltar had held a special banquet in their honor, but at the end all the British officials withdrew discretely, leaving the four Jews alone. "Then," said Weizmann, "we fixed it."

The same evening, he told me something which he said he had never told anyone else, and which was in his secret papers which were only to be opened after his death. He later wrote to me, after he had read *The Palestine Diary,* saying that he would like me to deal with those papers.

One of Yale's assignments was to follow Wilson's preference for having private talks with key personalities capable of influencing the course of events. He did this with Lloyd George, General Allenby and Col. T.E. Lawrence, for example. Yale said he had a talk with Weizmann "somewhere in the Mediterranean in 1919," and asked him what might happen if the British did not support a national home for the Jews in Palestine. Weizmann thumped his fist on the table and the teacups jumped, "If they don't," he said, "we'll smash the British Empire as we smashed the Russian Empire."

Brandeis was in Washington during the summer of 1917 and conferred with Secretary of State Robert S. Lansing from time to time on Turkish-American relations and the treatment of Jews in Palestine.[148] He busied himself in particular with drafts of what later became the Balfour Declaration and the British Mandate for Palestine, and in obtaining American approval for them.[149] A considerable number of drafts were made in London and transmitted to the United States, through War Office channels, for the use of the American Zionist Political Committee. Some were detailed, but the British Government did not want to commit itself to more than a general statement of principles.

On 18 July, such a statement, approved in the United States, was forwarded by Lord Rothschild to Lord Balfour. It read as follows:

> His Majesty's Government, after considering the aims of the Zionist Organization, accepts the principle of recognizing Palestine as the National Home* of the Jewish people and the right of the

---

*The use of the term "National Home" was a continuation of the euphemism deliberately adopted since the first Zionist Congress, when the term "Heimstaette" was used instead of any of the possible German words signifying "state." At that time, its purpose was to avoid provoking the hostility of non-Zionist Jews.[151]

> Jewish people to build up its national life in Palestine under a protection to be established at the conclusion of peace, following upon the successful issue of war.
>
> His Majesty's Government regards as essential for the realization of this principle the grant of internal autonomy to the Jewish nationality in Palestine, freedom of immigration for Jews, and the establishment of a Jewish national colonization corporation for the resettlement and economic development of the country.
>
> The conditions and forms of the internal autonomy and a charter for the Jewish national colonizing corporation should, in the view of His Majesty's Government, be elaborated in detail, and determined with the representatives of the Zionist Organization.[150]

It seems possible that Balfour would have issued this declaration but strong representatives against it were made directly to the Cabinet by Lucien Wolf, Claude Montefiore, Sir Mathew Nathan, Secretary of State for India Edwin Montagu,* and other non-Zionist Jews. It was significant, they believed, that "anti-semites are always very sympathetic to Zionism," and though they would welcome the establishment in Palestine of a center of Jewish culture, some—like Philip Magnes—feared that a political declaration would antagonize other sections of the population in Palestine, and might result in the Turks dealing with the Jews as they had dealt with the Armenians.[154] The Jewish opposition was too important to ignore, and the preparation of a new draft was commenced. At about this time, Northcliffe and Reading** visited Washington and had a discussion with Brandeis at which they undoubtedly discussed Zionism.[155]

Multiple pressures at key points led Lord Robert Cecil to telegraph to Col. E.M. House on 3 September 1917: "We are being pressed here for a declaration of sympathy with the Zionist movement and I should be very grateful if you felt able to ascertain unofficially if the President favours such a declaration."[156] House, who had performed services relating to Federal Reserve and cur-

---

The author or inventor of the term "Heimstaette" was Max Nordau who coined it "to deceive by its mildness" until such time as "there was no reason to dissimulate our real aim."[152]

The Arabic translation of "National Home" ignores the intended subtlety, and the words employed: *watan*, *qawm*, and *sha'b*, are much stronger in meaning than an abstract notion of government.[153]

*(1879–1924). His father, the first Lord Swaythling, and Herbert Samuel's father were brothers.

**Rufus Isaacs, a Jewish lawyer, who had quickly risen to fame in his profession, and then in politics. This was a period when elevations to the peerage for political and financial assistance to the party in power were so numerous that the whole system of British peerage was weakened. In 1916, Isaacs was a viscount; in 1917 an earl.

rency legislation for Jacob W. Schiff and Paul Warburg,[157] and was Wilson's closet adviser, relayed the message, but a week later Cecil was still without a reply.

On 11 September the Foreign Office had ready for dispatch the following message for Sir William Wiseman,* head of the British Military Intelligence Service in the United States: "Has Colonel House been able to ascertain whether the President favours sympathy with Zionist aspirations as asked in my telegram of September 3rd? We should be most grateful for an early reply as September 17th is the Jewish New Year and announcement of sympathy by or on that date would have excellent effect." But before it was sent, a telegram from Colonel House dated 11 September reached the Foreign Office.

Wilson had been approached as requested and had expressed the opinion that "the time was not opportune for any definite statement further, perhaps, than one of sympathy, provided it can be made without conveying any real commitment." Presumably, a formal declaration would presuppose the expulsion of the Turks from Palestine, but the United States was not at war with Turkey, and a declaration implying annexation would exclude an early and separate peace with that country.[158]

In a widely publicized speech in Cincinnati on 21 May 1916, after temporarily relinquishing his appointment as Ambassador to Turkey in favor of a Jewish colleague, Henry Morgenthau had announced that he had recently suggested to the Turkish Government that Turkey should sell Palestine to the Zionists after the war. The proposal, he said, had been well received, but its publication caused anger in Turkey.[159]

Weizmann was "greatly astonished" at this news, especially as he had "wired to Brandeis requesting him to use his influence in our favour . . . But up to now I have heard nothing from Brandeis."[161]

On 19 September Weizmann cabled to Brandeis:

> Following text declaration has been approved by Foreign Office and Prime Minister and submitted to War Cabinet:
>
> (1) H.M. Government accepts the principle that Palestine should be reconstituted as the national home of the Jewish people.
>
> (2) H.M. Government will use its best endeavours to secure the achievement of the object and will discuss the necessary methods and means with the Zionist Organization.[162]

Weizmann suggested that non-Zionist opposition should be forestalled, and in this it would "greatly help if President Wilson and yourself support the text. Matter most urgent."[163] He followed this up with a telegram to two leading New York Zionists, asking them to "see Brandeis and Frankfurter to immediately discuss my last two telegrams with them," adding that it might be necessary for him to come to the United States himself.[164]

---

*Joined Kuhn, Loeb & Co. in 1921, and was responsible for their liaison with London banks, and was "in charge of financing several large enterprises."[160]

Brandeis saw House on 23 September and drafted a message, sent the following day through the British War Office. It advised that presidential support would be facilitated if the French and Italians made inquiry about the White House attitude, but he followed this the same day with another cable stating that from previous talks with the President and in the opinion of his close advisers, he could safely say that Wilson would be in complete sympathy.[165]

Thus Brandeis had either persuaded Wilson that there was nothing in the draft (Rothschild) declaration of 19 September which could be interpreted as "conveying any real commitment," which is difficult to believe, or he had induced the President to change his mind about the kind of declaration he could approve or was sure he and House could do so.[166]

On 7 February 1917, Stephen Wise had written to Brandeis: "I sent the memorandum to Colonel House covering our question, and he writes, 'I hope the dream you have may soon become a reality'."[167] In October, after seeing House together with Wise, de Haas reported to Brandeis: "He has told us that he was as much interested in our success as ourselves." To Wilson, House stated that "The Jews from every tribe descended in force, and they seem determined to break in with a jimmy, if they are not let in."[168] A new draft declaration had been prepared; Wilson had to support it.

On 9 October 1917, Weizmann cabled again to Brandeis from London of difficulties from the "assimilants" opposition: "They have found an excellent champion . . . in Mr. Edwin Montagu who is a member of the Government and has certainly made use of his position to injure the Zionist cause."[169]

Weizmann also telegraphed to Brandeis a new (Milner-Amery) formula. The same draft was cabled by Balfour to House in Washington on 14 October:

> His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish race and will use its best endeavours to facilitate achievement of this object; it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed in any other country by such Jews who are fully contented with their existing nationality and citizenship.[170]

It was reinforced by a telegram from the U.S. Embassy in London direct to President Wilson (by-passing the State Department), stating that the "question of a message of sympathy with the (Zionist) movement" was being reconsidered by the British Cabinet "in view of reports that (the) German Government are making great efforts to capture (the) Zionist movement."[171]

Brandeis and his associates found the draft unsatisfactory in two particulars. They disliked that part of the draft's second safeguard clause which read, "by such Jews who are fully contented with their existing nationality and citizenship," and substituted "the rights and civil political status enjoyed by Jews in any country." In addition, Brandeis apparently proposed the change of "Jewish race" to "Jewish people."[172]

Jacob de Haas, then Executive Secretary of the Provisional Zionist Committee, has written that the pressure to issue the declaration was coming from the English Zionist leaders: "they apparently needed it to stabilize their position against local anti-Zionism. If American Zionists were anxious about it, Washington would act." De Haas continues:

> Then one morning Baron Furness, one of England's unostentatious representatives, brought to 44 East 23rd Street, at that time headquarters of the Zionist Organization, the final draft ready for issue. The language of the declaration accepted by the English Zionists based as it was on the theory of discontent was unacceptable to me. I informed Justice Brandeis of my views, called in Dr. Schmarya Levin and proceeded to change the text. Then with Dr. Wise, I hurried to Colonel House. By this time he had come to speak of Zionism as "our cause." Quietly he perused my proposed change, discussed its wisdom and promised to call President Wilson on his private wire and urge the change. He cabled to the British Cabinet. Next day he informed me that the President had approved. I had business that week-end in Boston and it was over the long distance wire that my secretary in New York read to me the final form as repeated by cable from London. It was the text as I had altered it.[173]

"It seems clear," wrote Stein, "that it was not without some prompting by House that Wilson eventually authorized a favourable reply to the British enquiry." Sir William Wiseman, "who was *persona grata* both with the President and with House, was relied upon by the Foreign Office for dealing with the declaration at the American end. Sir William's recollection is that Colonel House was influential in bringing the matter to the President's attention and persuading him to approve the formula."[174]

On 16 October 1917, after a conference with House, Wiseman telegraphed to Balfour's private secretary: "Colonel House put the formula before the President, who approves of it but asks that no mention of his approval shall be made when His Majesty's

Government makes formula public, as he had arranged that American Jews shall then ask him for approval, which he will publicly give here."[175]

The *Balfour Declaration*, as stated, was issued on 2 November 1917. Its text, seemingly so simple, had been prepared by some of the craftiest of the craft of legal drafting. Leaflets containing its message were dropped by air on Germany and Austria and on the Jewish belt from Poland to the Baltic Sea.

Seven months had passed since America entered the war. It was an epochal triumph for Zionism, and some believe, for the Jews.

On the other hand, two months before the declaration, Sokolow had written of a marked falling off in "le philo-sémitisme d'autrefois," ascribed by some to the impression that the Russian Jews were the mainspring of Bolshevism; and on the day it was issued, *The Jewish Chronicle* complained of "the antisemitic campaign which a section of the press in this country, indifferent to the national interests, is sedulously conducting."[176]

There only remained certain courtesies to be effected. On 12 November 1917, Weizmann wrote a letter of thanks to Brandeis:

> ". . . I need hardly say how we all rejoice in this great event and how grateful we all feel to you for the valuable and efficient help which you have lent to the cause in the critical hour . . . Once more, dear Mr. Brandeis, I beg to tender to you our heartiest congratulations not only on my own behalf but also on behalf of our friends here and may this epoch-making be a beginning of great work for our sorely tried people and also of mankind."[177]

The other principal Allied governments were approached with requests for similar pronouncements. The French simply supported the British Government in a short paragraph on 9 February 1918. Italian support was contained in a note dated 9 May 1918 to Mr. Sokolow by their ambassador in London in which he stressed the religious divisions of communities, grouping "a Jewish naitonal centre" with "existing religious communities."

On 31 August 1918, President Wilson wrote to Rabbi Wise "to express the satisfaction I have felt in the progress of the Zionist movement . . . since . . . Great Britain's approval of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people." Brandeis joined in Zionist delight at the President's endorsement and wrote: "Since the President's letter, anti-Zionism is pretty near disloyalty and non-Zionism is slackening."[178] Non-Zionist Jews now had a hard time if they wanted to disseminate their views; if they could not support Zionism they were asked at least to remain silent.

On 30 June 1922, the following resolution was adopted by the United States Congress:

> Favouring the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people;
> Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That the United States of America favours the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which should prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christians and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected.*

All people tend to see the world and its events in terms of their own experience, ideas and prejudices. This is natural. It is a fact used by master politicians and manipulators of opinion who form their appeals accordingly. The case of the Balfour Declaration is a fascinating example of a scheme presenting a multiplicity of images according to the facet of mind on which it reflected.

There were critics of the Balfour Declaration, although among the cacophony of many events competing for attention, few but its beneficiaries concentrated on the significance of what was being offered. One was the Jewish leader and statesman Mr. Edwin Montagu, who had no desire that Jews should be regarded as a separate race and a distinct nationality.[181] The other was Lord Curzon, who became Foreign Secretary at the end of October 1918. He prepared a memorandum dated 26 October 1917, on the penultimate and final drafts of the Balfour Declaration and related documents, and circulated it in the Cabinet. It was titled "The Future of Palestine." Here are some extracts:

> I am not concerned to discuss the question in dispute between the Zionist and anti-Zionist Jews . . . I am only concerned in the more immediately practical questions:
>
> (a) What is the meaning of the phrase "a national home for the Jewish race in Palestine," and what is the nature of the obligation that we shall assume if we accept this as a principle of British policy?
>
> (b) If such a policy be pursued what are the chances of its successful realisation?

---

*This was introduced by Mr. Hamilton Fish. His interpretation of his action was clarified thirty-eight years later, when the World Zionists held their 25th Congress in Jerusalem. David Ben Gurion, as Prime Minister of Israel, in his address to the gathering stated: "every religious Jew has daily violated the precepts of Judaism by remaining in the diaspora"; and, citing the authority of the Jewish sages, said: "Whoever dwells outside the land of Israel is considered to have no god." He added: "Judaism is in danger of death by strangulation. In the free and prosperous countries it faces the kiss of death, a slow and imperceptible decline into the abyss of assimilation."[179] (continued on next page.)

If I seek guidance from the latest collection of circulated papers (The Zionist Movement, G.-164) I find a fundamental disagreement among the authorities quoted there as to the scope and nature of their aim.

A "national home for the Jewish race or people" would seem, if the words are to bear their ordinary meaning, to imply a place where the Jews can be reassembled as a nation, and where they will enjoy the privileges of an independent national existence. Such is clearly the conception of those who, like Sir Alfred Mond, speak of the creation in Palestine of "an autonomous Jewish State," words which appear to contemplate a State, i.e., a political entity, composed of Jews, governed by Jews, and administered mainly in the interests of Jews . . .

The same conception appears to underlie several other of the phrases employed in these papers, e.g., when we are told that Palestine is to become "a home for the Jewish nation," "a national home for the Jewish race," "a Jewish Palestine," and when we read of "the resettlement of Palestine as a national centre," and "the restoration of Palestine to the Jewish people," all these phrases are variants of the same idea, viz., the re-creation of Palestine as it was before the days of the dispersion.

On the other hand, Lord Rothschild, when he speaks of Palestine as "a home where the Jews could speak their own language, have their own education, their own civilization, and religious institutions under the protection of Allied governments," seems to postulate a much less definite form of political existence, one, indeed, which is quite compatible with the existence of an alien (so long as it is not Turkish) government . . .

Now what is the capacity as regards population of Palestine within any reasonable period of time? Under the Turks there is no such place or country as Palestine, because it is divided up between the *sanjak* of Jerusalem and the *vilayets* of Syria and Beirut. But let us assume that in speaking of Palestine in the present context we mean the old scriptural Palestine, extending from Dan to Beersheba, i.e., from Banias to Bir es-Sabi' . . . an area of less than 10,000 square miles. What is to become of the people of this country, assuming the Turk to be expelled, and the inhabitants not to have been exterminated by the war? There are over a half a million of these, Syrian Arabs—a mixed community with Arab, Hebrew, Canaanite, Greek, Egyptian, and possibly Crusaders' blood. They and their forefathers have occupied the country for the best part of 1,500 years. They own the soil, which belongs either to individual landowners or to village communities. They profess the Mohammadan faith. They will not

---

Mr. Hamilton Fish replied: "As author of the first Zionist Resolution patterned on the Balfour Resolution, I denounce and repudiate the Ben Gurion statements as irreconcilable with my Resolution as adopted by Congress, and if they represent the Government of Israel and public opinion there, then I shall disavow publicly my support of my own Resolution, as I do not want to be associated with such un-American doctrines."[180]

> be content either to be expropriated for Jewish immigrants, or to act merely as hewers of wood and drawers of water to the latter.

Wilson and the War

If the contract with Jewry was to bring the United States into the Great War in exchange for the promise of Palestine, did they in fact deliver, through Brandeis or anyone else?

For the German-Jewish princes of the purse in the United States, the evidence points more to the Russian revolution being the factor of most weight in determining their attitude.

Was it the resumption of Germany's submarine blockade, the sinking of the *Laconia*, the Zimmerman telegram, which really influenced Wilson for war? Was it the Zionist counsel of Brandeis? In a careful study, Prof. Alex M. Arnett showed in 1937 that Wilson had decided to put the United States into the war on the side of the Allies many months before the resumption of U-boat warfare by Germany, which was promoted as a sufficient reason.[182]

In the propaganda battle for American public opinion between Britain and Germany, the former had the advantage of language, and the fact that on 5 August 1914 they had cut the international undersea cables linking Germany and the United States, thus eliminating quick communication between those two countries and giving British "news" the edge in forming public opinion.

The success of British propaganda methods were acknowledged by a German soldier of the time when he dictated his memoirs, *Mein Kampf*, in 1925: "In England propaganda was regarded as a weapon of the first order, whereas with us it represented the last hope of a livelihood for our unemployed politicians and a snug job for shirkers of the modest heroic type. Taken all in all, its results were negative."

British propaganda portrayed the war as one of just defense against a barbarian aggressor akin to the hordes of Genghis Khan, who were rapers of nuns, mutilators of children, led by the Kaiser—pictured as a beast in human form, a lunatic, deformed monster, modern judas, and criminal monarch.

Stories that German soldiers cut off the hands of Belgian children and crucified prisoners and perpetrated and all sorts of other atrocities said to have been practiced in Belgium, were circulated as widely as possible. The story about their making glycerine and soap from corpses did not appear until the end of April 1917, when new stories were created by American propagandists. One, a book called *Christine*, by "Alice Cholmondeley," a collection of letters purporting to have been written by a teenage girl music student to her mother in Britain until her death in 1914, mingled a damning catalogue of alleged German character faults with emotional feelings for her fictitious mother and music. Propaganda experts rated it highly.[183]

The head of the American section of the British propaganda bureau, Sir Gilbert Parker, was able to report on his success in the issue of his secret *American Press Review* for 11 October 1916, before the Presidential election: "This week supplies satisfactory evidence of the permeation of the American Press by British influence."

Men of British ancestry still dominated the powerful infrastructure of the economy, filled top positions in the State Department, in the influential Eastern universities, in the communications and cultural media. Britain and France were more identified with democracy and freedom, and the Central Powers with imperial militaristic autocracy. From Oyster Bay, former President Theodore Roosevelt, recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize, performed high-pitched war dances of words in support of belligerency.

But at the Democratic convention, and in the subsequent campaign, it was William Jennings Bryan and his allied orators who created the theme and slogan: "He kept us out of war."

Bryan had resigned as Secretary of State in June 1915 because he believed Wilson was jeopardizing American neutrality and showing partiality towards England. In his last interview, he told Wilson bitterly, "Colonel House has been Secretary of State, not I, and I have never had your full confidence."

House, a secretive and subtle flatterer who had performed services relating to the Federal Reserve Bank and currency legislation for Jacob W. Schiff and Paul Warburg, was perceived by Wilson as the "friend who so thoroughly understands me," "my second personality . . . my independent self. His thoughts and mine are one."

Bryan had wanted to go on a peace mission to Europe at the beginning of 1915, but the President sent House instead. House had actually sailed on the British ship *Lusitania* and as it approached the Irish coast on 5 February, the captain ordered the American flag to be raised.

The Intimate Papers of Colonel House record that on the morning of 7 May 1915, he and the British Foreign Secretary Grey drove to Kew. "We spoke of the probability of an ocean liner being sunk," recorded House, "and I told him if this were done, a flame of indignation would sweep across America, which would in itself probably carry us into the war." An hour later, House was with King George in Buckingham Palace. "We fell to talking, strangely enough," the Colonel wrote that night, "of the probability of Germany sinking a trans-Atlantic liner. . . ." He said, "Suppose they should sink the *Lusitania* with American passengers on board. . . ."

That evening House dined at the American Embassy. A dispatch came in, stating that at two in the afternoon a German submarine had torpedoed and sunk the *Lusitania* off the southern coast of Ireland. 1,200 lives were lost, including 128 Americans. It took 60 years for the truth about its cargo to be confirmed; that it had carried munitions which exploded when the torpedo hit. But Secretary of State Bryan remarked to his wife, "I wonder if that ship carried munitions of war? . . . If she did carry them, it puts a different face on the whole matter! England has been using our citizens to protect her ammunition."

In a telegram to President Wilson from England on 9 May 1915, House said he believed an immediate demand should made to Germany for assurance against a similar incident.

> I should inform her that our Government expected to take measures . . . to ensure the safety of American citizens.
>
> If war follows, it will not be a new war, but an endeavor to end more speedily an old one. Our intervention will save, rather than increase loss of life. We can no longer be neutral spectators . . .

In another telegram on 25 May, he noted that he had received from Ambassador Gerard a cable that Germany is in no need of food. "This does away with their contention that the starving of Germany justified their submarine policy."

The next day, House lunched with Sir Edward Grey and read him all the telegrams that had passed between the President, Gerard and himself since last they had met. And he wrote on 30 May 1915, "I have concluded that war with Germany is inevitable, and this afternoon at six o'clock I decided to go home on the S.S. *St. Paul* on Saturday. I sent a cable to the President to this effect." After his arrival in the United States, he wrote to the President from Rosslyn, Long Island, on 16 June 1915, a long letter which included the paragraph:

> I need not tell you that if the Allies fail to win, it must necessarily mean a reversal of our entire policy.
>
> I think we shall find ourselves drifting into war with Germany . . . Regretable as this would be, there would be compensations. The war would be more speedily ended, and we would be in a strong position to aid the other great democracies in turning the world into the right paths. It is something that we have to face with fortitude, being consoled by the thought that no matter what sacrifices we make, the end will justify them. Affectionately yours, E.M. House.

Are these references related to Zionism or Palestine? I think not. Perhaps the clue is that immediately after the election of Wilson, House had anonymously published a political romance entitled *Philip Dru: Administrator.* Dru leads a revolt and becomes a dictator in Washington, where he formulates a new American consitution and brings about an international grouping or league of Powers.

Let us look to the other side of the water again in 1916, a year later.

About a month before Malcolm's meeting with Sir Mark Sykes, Lloyd George gave an interview to the President of the United Press Association of America, in which he said "that Britain had only now got into her stride in her war effort, and was justifiably suspicious of any suggestion that President Wilson should choose this moment to 'butt in' with a proposal to stop the war before we could achieve victory."

"The whole world . . . must know that there can be no outside interference at this stage. Britain asked no intervention when she was unprepared to fight. She will tolerate none now that she is prepared, until the Prussian military despotism is broken beyond repair. . . . The motto of the Allies was '*Never Again!*' " And this made worthwhile the sacrifices so far as well as those needed to end the war with victory.[184]

Grey wrote to him on the 29th of September that he was apprehensive about the effect "of the warning to Wilson in your interview, . . . It has always been my view that until the Allies were sure of victory the door should be kept open for Wilson's mediation."

But the following month, at one of the formal regular meetings with the Chief of the Imperial Staff, when Lloyd George received the familiar answers as to the course of the war—the German losses were greater than the Allies, that the Germans were gradually being worn down, and their morale shaken by constant defeat and retreat—he asked Sir Wm. Robertson for his views as "to how this sanguinary conflict was to be brought to a successful end . . . He just mumbled something about 'attrition'."

Lloyd George then asked for a formal memorandum on the subject. This was not encouraging, and said that an end could not be expected "before the summer of 1918. How long it may go on afterwards I cannot even guess."

The facts were far from rosy, but were the hopes of Great Britain really hanging upon American entry into the war? There were two other possible courses.

One was suggested by the Marquess of Landsdowne, a member of the Cabinet and a statesman of considerable standing as the author of the *Entente Cordiale* in 1904. It was contained in a Memorandum Respecting a Peace Settlement, circulated to the Cabinet with the consent of the Prime Minister. Landsdowne suggested doubts as to the possibility of victory within a reasonable space of time.

> What does the prolongation of the war mean? Our own casualties already amount to over 1,100,000. We have had 15,000 officers killed, not including those who are missing. There is no reason to suppose that, as the force at the front in the different theatres of war increases, the casualties will increase at a lower rate. We are slowly but surely killing off the best of the male population of these islands. The figures representing the casualties of our Allies are not before me. The total must be appalling.[185]

The other members of the Cabinet and the Chief of Staff repudiated peace without victory.

The other course was that adopted: to thrust more men and money into the holocaust (defined as a wholesale sacrifice or destruction). What would now be called political and military summit meetings were held in France to plan for it. They commenced on 15 November 1916.

In the political presentations, the only reference to America seems to have been offered by Lloyd George:

> The difficulties we have experienced in making payment for our purchases abroad must be as present to the minds of French statesmen as to ourselves. Our dependence upon America is growing for food, raw material and munitions. We are rapidly exhausting the securities negotiable in America. If victory shone on our banners our difficulties would disappear. (Asquith deleted the next sentence, which read) Success means credit: financiers never hesitate to lend to a prosperous concern: but business which is lumbering along amidst great difficulties and which is making no headway in spite of enormous expenditure will find the banks gradually closing their books against it.

This reference to Allied problems in getting more credit from the bankers in the United States, who were predominantly German-Jewish, elucidates Schiff's agreement to arrange credit for Britain through the Jewish banker Cassel—they were not waiting for a Balfour Declaration, they were waiting for the Russian Revolution!

On the military side, there was general agreement at the summit conference that what was needed was a "knock-out blow," and it was decided that the 1917 plan of campaign would be an offensive on all fronts, including Palestine, with the Western Front as the principal one.

On 7 December the Asquith government fell and Lloyd George, who was pledged to a more vigorous prosecution of the war, took over the Government. Five days later, Germany and her allies put forward notes in which they stated their willingness to consider peace by compromise and negotiations.

The first of the battles opened on 9 April 1917, heralded by a bombardment of 2,700,000 shells. Another attack was launched by the French nine days later, these resulting in about a million dead and wounded on both sides. The French Army mutinied, and General Petain was put in charge.

At this time the two events which were to twist the world into a new shape were occurring, the Russian Revolution and American entry into the war.

The French Government wanted to defer all offensive operations until American assistance became available, but the generals thought otherwise. Maj.-Gen. J.F.C. Fuller, whom I have met, one of the few bright military-political minds in this century, tells us that Haig "had set his heart on a decisive battle in Flanders, and so obsessed was he by it that he believed that he could beat the Germans single-handed, and before the Americans came in."[186] I do not think that people who did not live in the great days of the British Empire can have a sense of the hubris of a Haig, unless one gets it from classical literature. Perhaps today it would be found in the head of the World Bank, from whom we taxpayers, like the common soldiers of that time, are so far removed! There was actually resentment in the England of my boyhood about Americans claiming to have played any significant part in fighting the Great War.

The outcome of the grandiosity of the generals and politicians was the costly Flanders campaign of the summer and autumn. On 7th June it was opened by the limited and successful Battle of Messines, which was preceded by a seventeen days' bombardment of 3,500,000 shells, and initiated by the explosion of nineteen mines packed with a million pounds of high explosives.

On 31st July it was followed by the Third Battle of Ypres, for which the largest force of artillery ever seen in British history was assembled. In all, the preliminary bombardment lasted nineteen days, and during it 4,300,000 shells, some 107,000 tons in weight, were hurled onto the prospective low lying battlefield. Its entire surface was upheaved; all drains, dikes, culverts and roads were destroyed, and an almost uncrossable swamp created, in which the infantry wallowed for three and a half months. When, on 10th November, the battle ended, the Germans had been pushed back a maximum depth of five miles on a frontage of ten miles, at a cost of a little under 200,000 men to themselves, and, at the lowest estimate, of 300,000 to their enemy.

Thus ended the last of the great artillery battles of attrition on the Western Front, and when in retrospect they are looked on, it becomes understandable why the politicians were so eager to escape them.

The Great War was like a greatly magnified version of the mutual destruction of noble men in the *Niebelungenlied.* Set against each other by the vanity and lack of vision of their rulers, the more they fought the more there was to avenge until death delivered them from their need. "At the going down of the sun and in the morning," we should learn their lesson.

Britain's Obligation?

In a memorandum marked in his own handwriting "Private & Confidential" to Lord Peel and other members of the Royal Commission on Palestine in 1936, James Malcolm wrote:

> I have always been convinced that until the Jewish question was more or less satisfactorily settled there could be no real or permanent peace in the world, and that the solution lay in Palestine. This was one of the two main considerations which impelled me, in the autumn of 1916, to initiate the negotiations which led eventually to the Balfour Declaration and the British Mandate for Palestine. The other, of course, was to bring America into the War.
>
> For generations Jews and Gentiles alike have assumed in error that the cause of Anti-Semitism was in the main religious. Indeed, the Jews in the hope of obtaining relief from intolerance, engaged in the intensive and subversive propagation of materialistic doctrines productive of "Liberalism," Socialism, and Irreligion, resulting in de-Christianisation. On the other hand, the more materialistic the Gentiles became, the more aware they were subconsciously made of the cause of Anti-Semitism, which at bottom was, and remains to this day, primarily an economic one. A French writer—Vicomte de Poncins—has remarked that in some respects Anti-Semitism is largely a form of self-defence against Jewish economic aggression. In my opinion, however, neither the Jews nor the Gentiles bear the sole responsibility for this.
>
> As I have already said, I had a part in initiating the negotiations in the early autumn of 1916 between the British and French Governments and the Zionist leaders, which led to the Balfour Declaration and the British Mandate for Palestine.
>
> The first object, of course, was to enlist the very considerable and necessary influence of the Jews, and especially of the Zionist or Nationalist Jews, to help us bring America into the War at the most critical period of the hostilities. This was publicly acknowledged by Mr. Lloyd George during a recent debate in the House of Commons.
>
> Our second object was to enable and induce Jews all the world over to envisage constructive work as their proper field, and to take their minds off destructive and subversive schemes which, owing to their general sense of insecurity and homelessness, even in the periods preceding the French Revolution, had provoked so much trouble and unrest in various countries, until their ever-increasing violence culminated in the Third International and the Russian Communist Revolution. But to achieve this end it was necessary to promise them Palestine in consideration of their help, as already ex-

> plained, and not as a mere humanitarian experiment or enterprise, as represented in certain quarters.

It is no wonder that Weizmann did not refer to Malcolm in his autobiography, and Sokolow privately resented Malcolm "as a stranger in the center of our work," who was "endowed with an *esprit* of a goyish kind."[187]

It is also worth noting that on page seven of his memorandum, Malcolm quoted General Ludendorff, former Quartermaster-General of the German Army, and perhaps at least remembered for heading an unsuccessful coup in Munich in 1923, as saying that the Balfour Declaration was "the cleverest thing done by the Allies in the way of propaganda and that he wished Germany had thought of it first."

On the other hand, might it not have provided some cold comfort for Ludendorff to believe that the Zionist Jews were a major factor in the outcome of the war—if that is what he is implying?

Malcolm's belief in the Balfour Declaration as a means of bringing the United States into the war was confirmed by Samuel Landman, secretary to the Zionist leaders Weizmann and Sokolow, and later secretary of the World Zionist Organization. As

> the only way (which proved so to be) to induce the American President to come into the war was to secure the cooperation of Zionist Jews by promising them Palestine, and thus enlist and mobilize the hitherto unsuspectedly powerful forces of Zionist Jews in America and elsewhere in favour of the Allies on a *quid pro quo* contract basis. Thus, as will be seen, the Zionists having carried out their part, and greatly helped to bring America in, the Balfour Declaration of 1917 was but the public confirmation of the necessarily secret "gentlemens' " agreement of 1916, made with the previous knowledge, acquiescence, and or approval of the Arabs, and of the British, and of the French and other Allied governments, and not merely a voluntary, altruistic and romantic gesture on the part of Great Britain as certain people either through pardonable ignorance assume or unpardonable ill-will would represent or rather misrepresent . . .[188]

Speaking in the House of Commons on 4 July 1922, Winston Churchill asked rhetorically,

> Are we to keep our pledge to the Zionists made in 1917 . . .? Pledges and promises were made during the war, and they were made, not only on the merits, though I think the merits are considerable. They were made because it was considered they would be of value to us in our struggle to win the war. It was considered that the support which the Jews could give us all over the world, and particularly in the United States, and also in Russia, would be a definite palpable advantage. I was not responsible at that time for

> the giving of those pledges, nor for the conduct of the war of which they were, when given, an integral part. But like other members I supported the policy of the War Cabinet. Like other members, I accepted and was proud to accept a share in those great transactions, which left us with terrible losses, with formidable obligations, but nevertheless with unchallengable victory.

However, Hansard notes, one member, Mr. Gwynne, plaintively complained that "the House has not yet had an opportunity of discussing it."

Writing to *The Times* on 2 November 1949, Malcolm Thomson, the official biographer of Lloyd George, noted that this was the thirty-second anniversary of the Balfour Declaration and it seemed a

> suitable occasion for stating briefly certain facts about its origin which have recently been incorrectly recorded.
>
> When writing the official biography of Lloyd George, I was able to study the original documents bearing on this question. From these it was clear that although certain members of the Cabinets of 1916 and 1917 sympathized with Zionist aspirations, the efforts of Zionist leaders to win any promise of support from the British Government had proved quite ineffectual, and the secret Sykes-Picot agreement with the French for partition of spheres of interest in the Middle East seemed to doom Zionist aims. A change of attitude was, however, brought about through the initiative of Mr. James A. Malcolm, who pressed on Sir Mark Sykes, then Under-Secretary to the War Cabinet, the thesis that an allied offer to restore Palestine to the Jews would swing over from the German to the allied side the very powerful influence of American Jews, including Judge Brandeis, the friend and adviser of President Wilson. Sykes was interested, and at his request Malcolm introduced him to Dr. Weizmann and the other Zionist leaders, and negotiations were opened which culminated in the Balfour Declaration.
>
> These facts have at one time or another been mentioned in various books and articles, and are set out by Dr. Adolf Boehm in his monumental history of Zionism, "Die Zionistische Bewegung," Vol. I, p. 656. It therefore surprised me to find in Dr. Weizmann's autobiography, "Trial and Error," that he makes no mention of Mr. Malcolm's crucially important intervention, and even attributes his own introduction to Sir Mark Sykes to the late Dr. Gaster. As future historians might not unnaturally suppose Dr. Weizmann's account to be authentic, I have communicated with Mr. Malcolm, who not only confirms the account I have given, but holds a letter written to him by Dr. Weizmann on March 5, 1941, saying: "You will be interested to hear that some time ago I had occasion to write to Mr. Lloyd George about your useful and timely initiative in 1916 to bring about the negotiations between myself and my Zionist colleagues and Sir Mark Sykes and others about Palestine and Zionist support of the allied cause in America and elsewhere."

> No doubt a complexity of motives lay behind the Balfour Declaration, including strategic and diplomatic considerations and, on the part of Balfour, Lloyd George, and Smuts, a genuine sympathy with Zionist aims. But the determining factor was the intervention of Mr. Malcolm with his scheme for engaging by some such concesion the support of American Zionists for the allied cause in the first world war.
>
> Yours, & c.,
> MALCOLM THOMSON

According to Lloyd George's *Memoirs of the Peace Conference*, where, as planned many years before, the Zionists were strongly represented,

> There is no better proof of the value of the Balfour Declaration as a military move than the fact that Germany entered into negotiations with Turkey in an endeavor to provide an alternative scheme which would appeal to Zionists. A German-Jewish Society, the V.J.O.D.,* was formed, and in January 1918, Talaat, the Turkish Grand Vizier, at the instigation of the Germans, gave vague promises of legislation by means of which "all justifiable wishes of the Jews in Palestine would be able to meet their fulfilment."
>
> Another most cogent reason for the adoption by the Allies of the policy of the Declaration lay in the state of Russia herself. Russian Jews had been secretly active on behalf of the Central Powers from the first; they had become the chief agents of German pacifist propaganda in Russia; by 1917 they had done much in preparing for that general disintegration of Russian society, later recognised as the Revolution. It was believed that if Great Britain declared for the fulfillment of Zionist aspirations in Palestine under her own pledge, one effect would be to bring Russian Jewry to the cause of the Entente.
>
> It was believed, also, that such a declaration would have a potent influence upon world Jewry outside Russia, and secure for the Entente the aid of Jewish financial interests. In America, their aid in this respect would have a special value when the Allies had almost exhausted the gold and marketable securities available for American purchases. Such were the chief considerations which, in 1917, impelled the British Government towards making a contract with Jewry.[189]

As for getting the support of Russian Jewry, Trotsky's aims were to overthrow the Provisional Government and turn the imperialist war into a war of international revolution. In November 1917 the first aim was accomplished. Military factors primarily influenced Lenin to sign the peace treaty of Brest-Litovsk in 1918.

---

*Vereinigung Juedischer Organisationen in Deutschland zur Wahrung der Rechte des Osten. (Alliance of the Jewish Organizations of Germany for the Safeguarding of the Rights of the East.)

The Zionist sympathizers Churchill and George seemed never to lose an opportunity to tell the British people that they had an *obligation* to support the Zionists.

But what had the Zionists done for Britain?

Where was the documentation?

"Measured by British interests alone," wrote the Oxford historian Elizabeth Monroe in 1963, the Balfour Declaration "was one of the greatest mistakes in our imperial history!"

The Zionists had the Herzlian tradition—shall we call it—of "Promises, promises." Considerable credit for the diplomacy which brought into existence the Jewish national home must go to Weizmann. A British official who came into contact with him summarized his diplomatic method in the following words:

> When (the First World War) began, his cause was hardly known to the principal statesman of the victors. It had many enemies, and some of the most formidable were amongst the most highly placed of his own people . . . He once told me that 2,000 interviews had gone into the making of the Balfour Declaration. With unerring skill he adapted his arguments to the special circumstances of each statesman. To the British and Americans he could use biblical language and awake a deep emotional undertone; to other nationalities he more often talked in terms of interest. Mr. Lloyd George was told that Palestine was a little mountainous country not unlike Wales; with Lord Balfour the philosophical background of Zionism could be surveyed; for Lord Cecil the problem was placed in the setting of a new world organization; while to Lord Milner the extension of imperial power could be vividly portrayed. To me, who dealt with these matters as a junior officer of the General Staff, he brought from many sources all the evidences that could be obtained of the importance of a Jewish national home to the strategical position of the British Empire, but he always indicated by a hundred shades and inflections of the voice that he believed that I could also appreciate better than my superiors other more subtle and recondite arguments.[190]

Triumph and Tragedy

Herzl correctly predicted a great war between the Great Powers. His followers organized to be ready for that time to further their ambitions through exploiting the rivalry of the Great Powers. They had a vested interest in promoting that war and in its continuance until Palestine was wrested from Turkey by British soldiers.

They prepared for the Peace Conference at Versailles although they had no belligerent standing, but they had the weight of the Rothschilds, Bernard Baruch, Felix Frankfurter, and others, which made room for them.

In the Introduction to *The Palestine Diary* I wrote,

> The establishment in 1948 of a "Jewish state" in Palestine was a phenomenal achievement. In fifty years from the Zionist Congress in Basle, Switzerland, in 1897—attended by a small number of Jews who represented little more than themselves—the Zionist idea had captivated the vast majority of world Jewry, and enlisted in particular Britain, America and the United Nations to intervene in Palestine in its support.

In 1983, seventy-five years after the Balfour Declaration and nearly ninety years after the first Zionist Congress in Switzerland, a meeting was held there of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine—but the conferees were not Jews—they were Palestinians—two million are in exile—displaced by Jews!

Where is the meaning for us?

On a day-to-day level, we can look in our newspapers for Zionist tactics of influence and leverage which we can document they have used successfully in the past.

Then there is a long-term strategy. From the mass of material in a century of history and in our complex society of today I see the underlying effect of two themes. They influence the lives of every one of us, and will continue to do so unless a change is made.

We can see them clearly in their early formulation, before they had been fed as valid data into the information processing and software systems of our society, with the result that most of the answers we get are *wrong*!

They are found in the conversation of Herzl and Meyer-Cohn in 1895. The sets of ideas are those associated with Jewish nationalism and racism on the Right[191]—racism being defined by Sir Andrew Huxley P.R.S. as the belief in the subjugation of one race by another, and on the other hand the concept of "universalism."

Acceptance of this input from the Right into our computations has resulted in the transfer of some $50 billion from our pockets into theirs.[192] In 1983, budgeted American tax money, labeled "aid," alone amounts to $625 for every man, woman and child in Israel.[193] It results in our acceptance of concentration camps for Palestinians containing thousands of people without a squeak from the so-called "international community"; in acceptance of their assassination, torture, deportation, closing of their schools and colleges, even of their massacre.[194] The lives of American troops—men and women, are committed to supporting these crimes.[195] Criticism is called "antisemitism," a word which computes as "unemployable social outcast."

Jewish nationalism and Israeli policy planned the present destabilization of Lebanon in 1955.[196] This is part of larger schemes to fragment and enfeeble possible challenges to their supremacy in the Middle East.[197]

On the other hand we have "universalism." This, I believe was the factor motivating Woodrow Wilson through House in his telegram of 30 May 1916 and letter of 16 June 1915 to the President, to which I have referred. "The League of Nations," the United Nations Organization, are its printouts. Just as House was a coefficient of the international bankers, so the United Nations and the international bankers have been part of the coefficient whereby over $400 billion of the earnings of workers in countries where universalism is a significant force, has been transferred to the peoples of Asia, Africa, South America and Communist countries; money needed for *our* capital investment.

People should ask: How is it that, with such multiplication of industrial power and resources, our peoples' standard of living and possibilities to have and support children have not multiplied accordingly? Why do so many of our women *have* to work? Why does no public figure—politician, labor leader—dare to ask—and raise the roof?

Universalism and Marxism compete superficially for first place as finalists in western culture distortion. Both promote its ethnic dilution, but deny us the reality of racial differences. Against our individuality and our nationalism, they and the global capitalists and their corporations unite as transnationals to reduce all but themselves to a common consumer market of blurred boundaries and one color. They would like one law—which they would make; one armed force—which they would control. Universalism would impose—not a global peace, but a global tyranny!

Universalism has come up with "interdependence," an expression used as a cover for the expropriation of our earnings as foreign aid in various forms; it has anesthetized the sense of self-defense of our countries so that those who have tried to stop their colonization by people from exploding populations of Africa, Asia and Latin America have been made to feel that they were depriving others of their "human rights."

In countries where they live other than Israel, Zionists are in the forefront of opposition to restrictions on immigration. Note that even in 1903 a leader of the fight against the Alien's Bill and against tightening up naturalization regulations in Britain was the pro-Zionist Winston S. Churchill, and the super-Zionist Herzl appeared before the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration to oppose any restriction.

And yet, my Arab friends born in Jerusalem are cast out and cannot return.

"If," said Herzl, "we wanted to bring about the unity of mankind independent of national boundaries, we would have to combat the ideal of patriotism. The latter, however, will prove stronger than we for innumerable years to come."

In a hundred years they have almost won that struggle.

In a conversation with Joseph Chamberlain in 1903, Theodore Herzl was asked how the Jewish colony would survive in the distant future. Herzl said, "We shall play the role of a small buffer state. We shall attain this not through the goodwill but from the jealousy of the Powers."

This is the game that Israel plays today, obtaining its military supplies, its high technology, and its billions of dollars from the pay packets of American workers, using the rivalry of the USSR and the U.S.A.

We should not allow ourselves to be made pawns in the games of others.

Appendix

SECRET

Political Intelligence Department,
Foreign Office.
Special 3.

Memorandum on British Commitments to King Husein

(Page 9) With regard to Palestine, His Majesty's Government are committed by Sir H. McMahon's letter to the Sherif on the 24th October, 1915, to its inclusion in the boundaries of Arab independence. But they have stated their policy regarding the Palestinian Holy Places and Zionist colonisation in their message to him of the 4th January, 1918:

> "That so far as Palestine is concerned, we are determined that no people shall be subjected to another, but that in view of the fact:
>
> "(a.) That there are in Palestine shrines, Wakfs, and Holy Places, sacred in some cases to Moslems alone, to Jews alone, to Christians alone, and in others to two or all three, and inasmuch as these places are of interest to vast masses of people outside Palestine and Arabia, there must be a special regime to deal with these places approved of by the world.
>
> "(b.) That as regards the Mosque of Omar, it shall be considered as a Moslem concern alone, and shall not be subjected directly or indirectly to any non-Moslem authority.
>
> "That since the Jewish opinion of the world is in favour of a return of Jews to Palestine, and inasmuch as this opinion must remain a constant factor, and further, as His Majesty's Government view with favour the realisation of this aspiration, His Majesty's Government are determined that in so far as is compatible with the freedom of the existing population, both economic and political, no obstacle should be put in the way of the realisation of this ideal."

This message was delivered personally to King Husein by Commander Hogarth, and the latter reported on his reception of it as follows:

> "The King would not accept an independent Jewish State in Palestine, nor was I instructed to warn him that such a State was contemplated by Great Britain. He probably knows nothing of the actual or possible economy of Palestine, and his ready assent to Jewish settlement there is not worth very much. But I think he appreciates the financial advantage of Arab co-operation with the Jews."

Notes

1. *A Survey of Palestine, 1945–1946,* H.M.S.O., Vol. I, p. 1.

2. Lowenthal, *The Diaries of Theodor Herzl,* pp. 35.

2a. *Ibid.,* p. 63.

2b. *Ibid.,* pp. 128-129, 132, 152, 176.

3. *Ibid.,* p. 215.

4. Weizmann, *Trial and Error,* p. 45-46.

5. Stein, Leonard, *Zionism,* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1932), p. 62.

6. Bein, Alex., *Theodor Herzl* (tr. Maurice Samuel), (Philadelphia: Jewish Palestine Society), pp. 304-305; Halpern, *The Ideal of a Jewish State,* p. 144.

7. *Ibid.,* For financial details, see pp. 262-264.

8. Lowenthal, *The Diaries of Theodor Herzl,* p. 398.

9. Lewisohn, Ludwig, *Theodor Herzl,* (New York: World, 1955), pp. 335-341.

10. Bein, *Theodor Herzl,* p. 490.

11. *Ibid.,* pp. 361ff, 378f.

12. Ziff, William B., *The Rape of Palestine,* (New York: Longmans & Green, 1938), p. 43.

13. British Foreign Office to Herzl, 19 June 1903, Zionist Archives, Jerusalem.

14. *Tagebuecher, vol. III, pp, 412-413 (24 April 1903), Berlin 1922.*

15. Stein, Leonard, *The Balfour Declaration,* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1916), pp. 24-29.

16. Lipsky, Louis, *A Gallery of Zionist Profiles,* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, 1956), p. 37.

17. Halpern, *The Idea of a Jewish State,* pp. 154-155.

18. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration,* p. 78.

19. *Ibid.,* p. 35.

20. Lipsky, *A Gallery of Zionist Profiles,* p. 94.

21. Alsberg, F.A., *Ha-Sh'ela ha-Aravit,* vol. I, *Shivat Zion,* IV, pp. 161-209. Quoted by Halpern in *The Idea of a Jewish State,* p. 267.

22. Lipsky, *A Gallery of Zionist Profiles,* p. 36.

23. *Ibid.,* p. 98.

24. Halpern, *The Idea of a Jewish State,* p. 267.

25. Lipsky, *A Gallery of Zionist Profiles,* pp. 95, 98.

26. Protocols of the 10th Zionist Congress, p. 11.

27. Lipsky, *A Gallery of Zionist Profiles,* p. 26.

28. Halpern, *The Idea of a Jewish State,* p. 267.

29. Report of the 12th Zionist Congress (London: Central Office of the Organization, 1922) pp. 13ff.

30. Bein, A., *Return to the Soil,* (Jerusalem: Zionist Organization, 1952) p. 27.

31. Hecht, Ben, *Perfidy,* (New York: Julian Messner, Inc., 1961), p. 254.

32. Reports submitted by the Executive of the Zionist Organization to the 12th Zionist Congress, London, 1921, *Palestine Report,* p. 7.

33. Hyamson, A.M., *The Near East, 31 Oct. 1913,* (London, 1917), p. 68.
34. *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40.
35. *Jewish Chronicle,* 16 October 1908.
36. *Die Welt,* 22 January 1909.
37. Protocols of the 11th Zionist Congress, p. 6.
38. Joffre, Joseph J.C., *The Memoirs of Marshal Joffre,* (London and New York: Harper & Brothers, 1932), Vol. 1, pp. 38-39.
39. Chamberlain, Austen, *Down the Years,* (London: Cassell & Co., 1935), p. 104.
40. Churchill, Winston L.S., *The World Crisis, 1911–1918,* (London: T. Butterworth, 1931), Vol. I, p. 234.
41. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration,* pp. 104-105.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 109.
43. *Ibid.*, pp. 233-234.
44. Adamov, E., Ed., *Die Europaeische Maechte und die Tuerkei Waehrend des Weltkriegs-Die Aufteilung der Asiatischen Tuerkei.* Translation from Russian (Dresden, 1932), No. 91.
45. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration,* p. 97.
46. For details see 1921 Reports submitted by the Executive Committee of the Zionist Organization to the Twelfth Zionist Congress, London, 1921.
47. Letter from Max Bodheimer to Otto Warburg, 22 November 1914 (Jerusalem: Zionist Archives), quoted in Stein, *The Balfour Declaration,* p. 98, n.8.
48. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration,* pp. 197-198.
49. Gottheil to Louis D. Brandeis, 1 October 1914 (unpublished).
50. London: *The Times,* 10 November 1914.
51. Letter from Greenberg to Herzl, 4 July 1903, quoted in Stein, *The Balfour Declaration,* p. 28. This seems to indicate Lloyd George's first contact with the Zionist movement: 'Lloyd George, as you know, is an M.P.; he, therefore, knows the ropes of these things and can be helpful to us.'
52. Samuel, Viscount Herbert, *Memoirs,* (London: Cresset Press, 1945), pp. 139ff.
53. Letter from Samuel to Weizmann, 11 January 1915, quoted in Stein, *The Balfour Declaration,* p. 109, fn. 24; also Samuel, *Memoirs,* p. 144.
54. Samuel, *Memoirs,* p. 143. In a letter of 20 November 1912 to the Zionist Executive, Weizmann mentioned Haldane as one of the important persons to whom he thought he could gain access: *Zionist Archives.*
55. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration,* p. 111, fn. 33; Crewe's mother-in-law was the Countess of Rosebery, daughter of Baron Mayer de Rothschild, see p. 112, fn. 34.
56. Samuel, *Memoirs,* p. 141.
57. Oxford and Asquith, Earl, *Memories and Reflections,* (London: Cassell, 1928), Vol. II, p. 59.
58. Samuel, *Memoirs,* pp. 143-144.
59. Oxford and Asquith, *Memories and Reflections,* Vol. II, p. 65.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 188; Reports submitted by the Executive Committee of the Zionist Organization to the Twelfth Zionist Congress, London 1921. 'Organization Report,' p. 113, gives a much smaller figure.
61. Rischin, Moses, *The Promised City: New York's Jews, 1870–1914,* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962).
62. German Foreign Office Documents at London Record Office, Washington to Berlin K 692/K 176709-10, and K 692/K 17611-12—Berlin to Washington, 1 November 1914. 'Some time ago we already strongly advised Turkey, on account of international Jewry, to protect Jews of every nationality, and we are now reverting to the matter once again.'
63. German Foreign Office Documents, K 692/K 176723 and 176745.
64. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration,* p. 201.
65. Richard Lichtheim to Leonard Stein, 12 February 1952, *The Balfour Declaration,* p. 209, fn. 9.
66. Report dated 8 March 1915, Papers of Nahum Sokolow, quoted in Stein, *The Balfour Declaration,* p. 210, fn. 10.

67. *Palestine Report* to 1921 Zionist Congress, p. 34.
68. Lichtheim, Richard, *Memoirs*, published in Hebrew version as *She'ar Yashoov*, (Tel Aviv: Newman, 1953), Chapter XV.
69. *Ibid.*, Chapter XVIII.
70. *The Times of History of the War;* Vol. XIV, pp. 320-321; Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, pp. 212-213; e.g., *Preussicher Jahrbuecher*, August-September 1915, article by Kurt Blumenfeld.
71. Lichtheim, *Memoirs*, Chapter XVIII; Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, pp. 213-214, fns. 21, 22.
72. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 214, fn. 23.
73. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, pp. 536-537; Note of the interview in memorandum 28 August 1917, Zionist Archives.
74. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 537. Even in 1959, Aaronssohn's superior, Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen, wrote: "I am not at liberty to divulge any of his exploits as it would publicize methods better kept secret"—*Middle East Diary 1917–1956* (New York: Yoseloff, 1960) p. 5.
75. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 217.
76. Conjoint Foreign Committee 1916/210, 5 April 1916; Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 218.
77. *Hatikvah* (Antwerp), December 1927, contains article by Basch.
78. Conjoint Foreign Committee, 1915/340.
79. *Ibid.*, 1916/183ff; Translated in Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 219.
80. Poincare, R., *Au Service de la France*, (Paris: Plon, 1926), Vol. VIII, p. 220, 15 May 1916.
81. Conjoint Foreign Committee, 1916/110, 124; Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 220.
82. Conjoint Foreign Committee, 1916/11ff; Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, pp. 220-221.
83. *Die Welt*, 1913, No. 35, p. 1146; Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 67.
84. Conjoint Foreign Committee, 1916/130ff, 18 February 1916; Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 221.
85. Conjoint Foreign Committee, 1916/206; Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 223.
86. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 225.
87. Adamov, E., ed., *Die Europaeische Maechte und die Tuerkei Waehrend des Weltkrieges, Die Aufteilung der Asiatischen Tuerkei.* Translation from Russian (Dresden, 1932), No. 80.
88. Conjoint Foreign Committee, 1916/387.
89. Lloyd George, *War Memoirs, 1915–1916*, p. 434.
90. Falls, Cyril, *The Great War*, (New York: Putnam, 1959), p. 180.
91. Yale, William, *The Near East: A Modern History*, (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1958) p. 263.
92. Gaster (Moses) Papers, quoted in Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 285, fn.
93. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, pp. 488-490.
94. Lloyd George, *War Memoirs, 1915–1916*, p. 276.
95. Landman, S., in *World Jewry, Balfour Declaration: Secret Facts Revealed*, (London: Independent Weekly Journal, 1935), Vol. 2, No. 43, 22 February 1935.
96. Landman, *Balfour Declaration: Secret Facts Revealed*, Vol. 2, No 43, 22 February 1935; also, Malcolm, *Origins of the Balfour Declaration: Dr. Weizmann's Contribution*, pp. 2-3.
97. Landman, *Balfour Declaration: Secret Facts Revealed*, Vol. 2, No. 43, 22 February 1935; also, Link, A.S., *Wilson, The New Freedom*, (Princeton: University Press, 1956) pp. 10ff, 13ff.
98. Ziff, *The Rape of Palestine*, p. 58.
99. Mason, Alphoes T.M., *Brandeis, A Free Man's Life*, (New York: Viking Press, 1956), p. 451.

100. *Ibid.*, p. 452.
101. Gwynn, Stephen, Ed., *Letters and Friendships of Sir Cecil Spring Rice*, (London: Constable, 1929), Vol. II, pp. 200-201.
102. Yale, *The Near East*, p. 268.
103. Mason, *Brandeis, A Free Man's Life*, p. 448.
104. *The Times Documentary History of the War*, London, 1917, Vol. IX, Part 3, p. 303.
105. National Archives, Department of State, Decimal File 1910–1929, No. 861.4016/325.
106. *Jewish Advocate*, 13 August 1915.
107. *Boston Post*, 4 October 1915.
108. The ESCO (Ethel Silverman Cohn) Foundation of Palestine, Inc., *Palestine: A Study of Jewish, Arab and British Policies*, (New Haven: Yale University Press 1947), Vol. I, pp. 87-89.
109. Sykes, *Two Studies in Virtue*, p. 187.
110. Somervell, D.C., *British Politics Since 1900*, (New York: Oxford University Press 1950), p. 113.
111. Report of the Twelfth Zionist Congress (London: Central Office of the Zionist Organization, 1922), p. 13ff.
112. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 25.
113. Antonius, *The Arab Awakening*, p. 263.
114. Taylor, Alan, *Prelude to Israel*, (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959), p. 19.
115. The ESCO Foundation, *Palestine, A Study of Jewish, Arab and British Policies*, Vol. I, pp. 92-93.
116. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, pp. 286-287.
117. The ESCO Foundation, *Palestine: A Study of Jewish, Arab and British Policies*, Vol. I, p. 94.
118. Taylor, *Prelude to Israel*, p. 20.
118a. Stein, p. 509, citing Brandeis' papers.
119. *New York Times*, 24 March 1917.
120. United States: State Department Document 861.00/288, 19 March 1917.
120a. Stein, p. 332, fn.
121. Sykes, *Two Studies in Virtue*, p. 196.
122. Jeffries, *Palestine: The Reality*, p. 140. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 396, fn. 10.
123. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, pp. 396-397.
124. *Ibid.*, p. 394, fn. 3.
125. Letter from Sokolow to Weizmann, quoted in Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 400, fn. 27.
126. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 400, fn. 29.
127. Landman, S., in *World Jewry, Balfour Declaration: Secret Facts Revealed* (London: Independent Weekly Journal 1935), 1 March 1935.
128. *Les Origines de la Déclaration Balfour, Question d'Israel*, (Paris, 1939), Vol. 17, p. 680 (Translation)
129. *Ibid.*
130. Translation from Russian in Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 395.
131. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 414.
132. Sykes, *Two Studies in Virtue*, p. 211.
133. Jeffries, *Palestine: The Reality*, p. 141.
134. Mason, *Brandeis, A Free Man's Life*, p. 452.
135. Dugdale, Blanche E.C., *Arthur James Balfour*, (London: Hutchinson, 1936), Vol. II, p. 231.
136. Mason, *Brandeis, A Free Man's Life*, pp. 452-453.
137. *The Times*, (London), 24 May 1917.
138. *Ibid.*, 28 May 1917.

139. Jeffries, *Palestine: The Reality*, p. 148.
140. *Ibid.*, p. 149.
141. *Ibid.*, p. 153.
142. Weizmann, *Trial and Error*, p. 179.
143. Stein, p. 462.
144. *Ibid.*
145. *Ibid.*
146. *Ibid.*, pp. 463-64.
147. Yale, *The Near East: A Modern History*, p. 241; Also article by William Yale in *World Politics*, (New Haven: April 1949), Vol. I, No. 3, pp. 308-320 on 'Ambassador Morgenthau's Special Mission of 1917'; Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, pp. 352-360.
148. Mason, *Brandeis, A Free Man's Life*, p. 453.
149. *Ibid.*, p. 453.
150. Jeffries, *Palestine: The Reality*, pp. 163-164.
151. De Haas, Jacob, *Theodor Herzl: A Biographical Study*, (Chicago: University Press, 1927), Vol. I, pp. 194 et seq.
152. Sykes, *Two Studies in Virtue*: On the basis of Nordau's manuscript, 'The Prosperity of His Servant,' p. 160 fn. 1.
153. Sadaqu, Najib, *Qadiyet Falastin*, (Beirut: 1946) pp. 19, 31.
154. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 526.
155. Mason, *Brandeis, A Free Man's Life*, p. 673.
156. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 504, fn. 5.
157. Seymour, Charles (ed. by), *The Intimate Papers of Col. House*, (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1926), pp. 161, 174.
158. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, pp. 504-505, fn. 5, 7.
159. *The Jewish Chronicle*, 26 May 1916. In a personal communication, Prof. W. Yale notes that the Cairo publisher Dr. Faris Nimr told him that Morgenthau had talked with the Khedive, Abbas Hilmi, in 1914, regarding a role in promoting the cession of Palestine to Egypt.
160. *New York Times, Obituary*, 18 June, 1962.
161. *Chaim Weizmann Papers* in Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 506.
162. Mason, *Brandeis, A Free Man's Life*, p. 453.
163. *Ibid.*, p. 453. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 506.
164. Brandeis to de Haas and Lewin-Epstein, 20 September 1917, *Brandeis Papers*, in Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 506.
165. *Ibid.*, Brandeis to House, 24 September 1917.
166. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, pp. 507-508.
167. *The Brandeis Papers* in Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 509.
168. *The Wilson Papers* in Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 509.
169. Mason, *Brandeis, A Free Man's Life*, p. 453.
170. *Ibid.*
171. Adler, '*The Palestine Question in the Wilson Era*,' pp. 305-306. Quoted in Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 528.
172. See 'The Zionist-Israel juridical claims to constitute "The Jewish people" nationality entity and to confer membership in it: Appraisal in public international law,' W.T. Mallinson, Jr., George Washington Law Review, Vol. 32, No. 5, (June 1964), pp. 983-1075, particularly p. 1015.
173. *The New Palestine*, published by the Zionist Organization of America, 28 October 1927, pp. 321, 343.
174. William Wiseman to Leonard Stein, 7 November 1952; in Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 529.
175. In a dispatch dated 19 May 1919 from Balfour to Curzon, 'The correspondence with Sir William Wiseman in October 1917' is mentioned as evidence of endorsement of the Balfour Declaration. *Document on British Foreign Policy*, First Series, Vol. IV, No. 196, fn. 4, p. 281.

176. Stein, pp. 561-62.
177. Mason, *Brandeis, A Free Man's Life*, p. 454.
178. *Ibid.*, p. 455.
179. *New York Times*, 8 January 1961, 53:6.
180. *Ibid.*, 14 January 1961, 22:5.
181. Lloyd George, *Memoirs of the Peace Conference*, Vol. II, p. 732.
182. *Claude Kitchen and the Wilson War Policies*, 1937, reprinted 1971, Russel.
183. Knightley, Phillip, *The First Casualty*, (N.Y.: Harcourt Brace, 1975), p. 122.
184. *War Memoirs of David Lloyd George*, (Boston: Little, Brown, 1933), pp. 280-3.
185. *War Memoirs*, p. 291.
186. *The Conduct of War*, J.F.C. Fuller, (New Brunswick: Rutgers, 1961), p. 171.
187. Translation from the Russian in Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 395.
188. *Great Britain, the Jews and Palestine*, (London, 1936), pp. 4-5, New Zionist Press.
189. George, *Memoirs of the Peace Conference*, p. 726.
190. Taylor, *Prelude to Israel*, p. 24.
191. Example: resigning Israeli Chief of Staff, Gen. Rafael Eytan, following the invasion of Lebanon, likened the Palestinians to "cockroaches."
192. The U.S. General Accounting Office figure for military and economic aid to Israel from 1948 through 1982 was $24 billion. To this must be added the tax-free contributions to Israeli organizations, loss on investment of funds in Israeli bonds by American cities such as New York, by labor unions, and other entities. To this add the costs of transfer of American technology to Israel. Since 1982, U.S. annual taxpayer levies for Israel have been increased by Congress, so that the cost of Israel for the United States could easily climb to well in excess of $100 billion over the next decade.
193. *New York Times*, 10 July 1983.
194. "I recall distinctly how our soldiers fired their weapons at the elderly, at women and children, all on order of their commanders. I witnessed the pleas and cries of small children after their mothers were brutally killed in front of them—by our soldiers. Some of the soldiers even fired phosphorus cannisters into Ein El-Helweh shelters, where hundreds of civilians had taken refuge. None of them survived." Account by Lt. Eytan Kleibneuf in *Haolam Hazeh*, Israel, 7 July 1982. Kleibneuf is a member of Mi'jan Michael Kibbutz and member of Mapam's United Kibbutzim Movement, and a reserve officer in the Israel infantry forces.

The West German weekly *Stern*, 24 August 1982, carried an article by Austria's Jewish Chancellor, Bruno Kreisky, stating that Israel had committed "gigantic crimes" in its invasion of Lebanon. "Israel stands morally naked. Its leaders have shown their true face," he concluded.

During Israel's invasion of Lebanon, the U.S. *Jewish Press* carried a regular column by Rabbi Meir Kahane advocating the killing of Palestinians of all ages. This, he wrote, was G-d's will as expressed in the Torah. Not to do so, opposed that will. This is the Holy War (*herem*) which God "commanded" the Hebrews to wage against the Canaanites for the possession of the Promised Land. The Old Testament repeatedly refers to the terror that the *herem* would produce and to Israel's obligation to destroy all persons with their property who remain in the land, lest they become slaves or corrupting influences. The Hebrew word *herem* designates a sacred sphere where ordinary standards do not apply, and in a military context, a *herem* is a total war of annihilation without limits against men, women, children, animals and property. For a discussion of the *herem* and its revival by the Zealots as reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see de Vaux, R., *Ancient Israel*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972, pp. 258-267.

In psychological terms, the defense for indulgence in the horror of *herem* is projection—projection of ideas of *herem* as being held by others, or indulging in behavior which invites the "Group-Fantasy of Martyrdom." See *Journal of Psychohistory*, Vol. 6, No. 2, Fall 1978, H.F. Stein, "The Psychodynamic Paradox of Survival Through Persecution," pp. 151-210.

(*Behind the Balfour Declaration*, Notes, continued on page 498.)

A Postwar View of the Greater East Asia War

MICHIKO HASEGAWA

In striking contrast to the situation in North America and Europe, historical revisionism enjoys widespread support and even official sanction in Japan. The growing willingness of the Japanese to reassess their nation's role in the "Greater East Asia War" received worldwide attention during the so-called "textbook controversy" of 1982, when new Japanese high school history textbooks were introduced that portrayed Japan's wartime role in a more positive light. Recent documentary films and "docudrama" television series about the war years have also contributed to the revisionist trend. And last August Yasuhiro Nakasone became the first postwar Prime Minister to make an official visit to the Yasukuni Shrine, a Shinto holy place in Tokyo honoring Japanese war dead, including wartime Prime Minister Hideki Tojo and other leaders who were hanged by the Americans as war criminals.

The article that follows is reprinted from a special 1984 issue of the attractive quarterly magazine, ***Japan Echo,*** *which consisted entirely of revisionist essays. It was widely distributed by the Toyota Motor Company, Japan Air Lines and the Japanese Foreign Ministry. Hayao Shimizu of the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies introduced the special issue with an editorial essay entitled "The War and Japan: Revisionist Views." Besides the various objective factors, he wrote, the subjective or psychological factor behind the remarkable recent growth of revisionism in Japan has been "the fervent enthusiasm ordinary people have shown for reconfirming* *their identity by means of a fresh look at history." The impetus has not come from scholars, but is rather based on a growing desire "among the Japanese in general to re-establish their sense of national identity." Shimizu went on to explain: "Perhaps we can say that at the root of such developments is a manifestation of the natural nationalism of the Japanese, which for most of the postwar period was suppressed, sometimes openly and at other times in covert fashion." Not surprisingly, leftists in Japan and abroad are not happy with this trend. "Clearly the direction being taken by the [historical] debate is not welcomed by those favorably inclined to the Marxist slant on history."*(Mark Weber)

From Darkness to Nothingness

Individuals in any era perceive a demarcation between the years preceding and following their own births. On a subconscious level, the years preceding one's birth are bathed in darkness to a greater or lesser degree. Birth is the beginning of time for an individual; anything occurring before this precedes time itself.

To those of us born around 1945 or 1946, however, this perception of time is neither individualistic nor subconscious. Actual darkness surrounds the time of our birth, so this darkness is not only perceived by us but also admitted by the adults we grew up with. Those of us born in the immediate postwar years see ourselves as children born of darkness.

The shadows of that darkness still remained when we were children. At the foot of an ancient burial mound that we used as a playground was an air raid shelter with its two entrances forced open. We were sternly warned not to go inside, for accidents involving children trapped in abandoned air raid shelters were common at the time. Yet motivated by something stronger than simple curiosity—more of a yearning—we wanted very much just once to enter and experience an air raid.

Adult talk in those days always returned to memories of the war—to searchlights crisscrossing the sky and confirming the presence of B-29s as they flew serenely above the reach of antiaircraft guns. To the incendiary bombs that fell by the gate of the house in front of ours. To mother trembling in fear, father rushing out with buckets to quench the fire, and mother's resentment at his delayed return. They would say, "I never want to go through that again," and yet on their faces we saw the intense excitement common to survivors of disaster, and we regretted not having shared the experience. Glimpsed in this way, the darkness of the past remained mysterious, half-frightening and half-enticing.

This childish curiosity gradually subsided as we reached school age, but now we were taught that the war years were a dark age in a totally different sense of the word. In addition to the period's shortages of food, clothing, and fuel and the ever-present danger of bombardment from the skies, we learned that the very light of reason itself had been abandoned. The war years were said to resemble the Dark Ages, that label used until recently to characterize the early European Middle Ages. We were taught that for inexplicable reasons the entire country had gone mad, thinking it could achieve the impossible and convinced that wrong was right.

If darkness carries this latter meaning, then defining oneself as a product of darkness is not comforting. We imagined that those responsible for the creation of the dark age had been punished and that the rest had repented and exorcised the darkness from themselves. The period, in short, was obliterated. Instead of seeing ourselves as children of darkness, accordingly, we became accustomed to the idea that we were born of nothingness.

The Blotted-out Word

Now that the postwar generation has reached maturity, for some reason I have been reading up on the war years. Records have been left by people of varying status and describe a multitude of experiences. They tell of soldiers burdened with cooking pots dragging their way across an endless plain in northern China, of engineers stifling in the polluted atmosphere of a submarine, of pilots in New Guinea taking off from Rabaul for an attack on Port Moresby, and of soldiers dying in the jungle of Guadalcanal. There are records of the officer at an operational headquarters who heard the report of the total annihilation of the Japanese on Attu Island and of families fleeing across Manchuria's Greater Khingan Range under Russian fire. Totally immersed in that era, I would suddenly glance at the sky, breathing a sigh of relief that, miraculously, no enemy planes hovered overhead.

After several months thus spent, a single reality, a word, began to form in my mind. On first perceiving it faintly, I realized that I had previously understood nothing of war. Simultaneously I understood what it was that had been cast in the oblivion of darkness and that no one would mention. It was the word *enemy.*

This word itself produced the war years, and consequently in the postwar era even its mention was taboo. In descriptions of the war, victims killed by fires in the great incendiary bombings of Tokyo "died in the air raids." Soldiers shot down by Chinese troops immediately upon disembarking from ships at Shanghai, and soldiers killed by hand grenades tossed into the underground tunnels on Iwo Jima, "died in the war." Even those instantly incinerated in the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki "died when the atomic bombs fell," as if God, by some slip of the hand, had let the bombs drop from heaven. This is not a question of phrasing. In reviewing the events of the war, the Japanese intentionally omit the word *enemy*.

Overlooking the existence of an enemy during wartime and describing only the deeds of one side cause such deeds to appear crazy and barbarous. And indeed we were taught that such was the nature of Japanese actions in the war. The extent to which the word *enemy* had been blotted out of contemporary society is extraordinary. The concept still exists in the world of crime, the sports world, and the Communist Party, but has been obliterated in the realm of international affairs.

This is a critical situation. Even in considering prevention of future wars, people seeing themselves as having no external enemies can conceive only of watching over their own country. Suppose the Soviet Union should decide to invade Japan. Ample grounds exist for supposing such an attack, so what steps should be taken? More fundamentally, how can an invasion be deterred? And yet in Japan, not even common-sense anti-war measures can be discussed without raising ideological hackles. (One segment of opinion holds that it is the United States that bears watching. The concern, however, is not that a Japanese-American military conflict will break out. It is that the United States, though a country much like Japan, is nonetheless a rival.)

In contemporary Japan, one comes across little of the humility that would admit to less than full understanding of the causes of war. Only with such humility will we gain the prudence to reevaluate potential sources of trouble in the complex world around us. Having determined that Imperial Japan's militarism is the sole danger we must guard against, we have closed our eyes to the true dangers of war. The situation is much like the way in which a majority of the Japanese fought the last war, disregarding the size and strength of the enemy. To be sure, when an attack by a formidable power is so overwhelming that escape is impossible, perhaps the best tactic is blind and desperate struggle, and indeed this is exactly how Japan conducted the war. But in a situation requiring deterrence rather than battle, blindness is less than helpful.

We must first review the meaning of the war using the word *enemy* precisely and fearlessly so that the prewar generation can revise its understanding of those years and we of the postwar generation can appreciate the era that bore us. This is the minimum essential step.

Fusao Hayashi's *Dai Toa senso kotei ron* (In Affirmation of the Great East Asia War) is an example of a review fulfilling this modest requirement. Contrary to what many people assume, this book expounds no ideology and asserts no dogma. It simply reviews in candid fashion the war's significance. In such a review, the reality of the enemy is immediately apparent. The enemies Japan actually faced—the groups of living human beings possessing power and will—are acknowledged.

The Reaction to the West

Hayashi interprets the war as the last phase of a "100-Year East Asia War" that began at the end of the Tokugawa period [in the 1860s]. To contemporary readers accustomed to the notion that each four or five years marks a "new age," this 100-year span may appear unfashionably long. The long span may also appear to imply that Hayashi is not really making a serious analysis of the period. But his purpose is not frivolous. He uses the term because a war of 100 years' duration did indeed take place.

When one considers that this 100-year period corresponds roughly with the heyday of colonialism in world history, it does not seem absurdly long. The interval from when the West began its serious conquest of Asia and Africa until a majority of the colonized countries regained their independence was slightly over 100 years. During that time, no Asian or African country was exempt from its own tragic 100-year war. The hopelessness of these struggles is seen in the fact that in only two cases, the Ethiopian victory over Italy in 1896 and the Japanese victory over Russia in 1905, did the underdog come out on top.

Japan's own 100-year war was but a minor part of that larger struggle. Though Japan may be seen as having been one of the more victorious countries, it never succeeded in shaking off the enemy. Some Japanese argue that in the course of that long period only Japan, of all the nations of Asia and Africa, managed to break free and brilliantly achieve a position on the "enemy side." The world powers, however, neither acknowledged nor approved of this achievement. The deeply rooted white intolerance of other races is evident in the boycotts of Japanese goods conducted by the West in the 1930s. Japan was not allowed to be other than an Asian nation, and it never attempted to be anything else.

A tragedy is a struggle by a protagonist against destiny that is doomed to end in defeat. Japan's very determination to make a stand as an Asian nation turned its struggle into a true tragedy. Hayashi makes precisely this point: "The 100-Year East Asia War was a hopeless struggle from the outset. Yet the fight had to be fought, and Japan fought it. What a reckless war we fought for 100 years!"

When a petty protagonist undertakes a gigantic task for the sake of petty gains, the drama may be seen as more of a farce than a tragedy, even if the outcome is disastrous. When most people speak of the tragedy of the war, what they really mean to say is that it was a farce with an unhappy ending. Hayashi, however, rejects this view. He refuses to call the war a farce, not to preserve the honor of the war dead but because he sees it as an erroneous view.

A perception of the 100-year war as a tragedy naturally must begin with a revised understanding of its roots in the last years of the Tokugawa regime. Hayashi dates the beginning of the war from the 1863 bombardment of Kagoshima by British ships and the 1864 bombardment of Shimonoseki by the vessels of several Western powers. In these two episodes of "Japanese history," the Japanese became acquainted with several Western countries that fill the pages of "world history." As the Japanese perceived this "world history," the West was brimming with vitality and full of ambitious people who used great power and devious strategems to achieve their ends—and who sometimes failed. Interestingly, the other Japanese view—that from the vantage point of "Japanese history"—somehow managed to strip the West of this vitality. The Japanese paintings of foreigners in the early Meiji era are revealing. Westerners like Commodore Matthew Perry are depicted with strangely deformed features robbing them of their character as Westerners. "Japanese history" failed to portray the freshness of the West.

Like Hayashi, however, the Japanese leaders in those days no doubt saw the Westerners in the context of "world history." They saw faces that, just over 10 years earlier, had stuffed Indians into cannons and blown them apart. They saw people who had made a national enterprise out of the forced sale of opium in China. With this smoking gun aimed directly at them, the Japanese rallied behind the slogans "Expel the Barbarians," "Open the Nation," and "Embark on Civilization and Enlightenment." In Hayashi's view, the "expel the barbarians" and "civilization and enlightenment" slogans were not the assertions of opposing ideologies. Both expressed awareness of the threat posed by the Western powers' eastward advance. In this threat was contained the essence of the tragic 100-Year East Asia War. And as I shall explain later, it contained an even deeper tragedy than that seen by Hayashi.

The commonplace perception of the movements toward "expelling the barbarians" and "civilization and enlightenment" as totally separate phenomena is an error made by later generations. Had the Meiji Japanese looked at the West solely as an excellent model, imitating it in dress, food, and creation of an army, a navy, and a constitution, they would eventually have come to regard a

Japanese invasion of other Far Eastern countries as a logical conclusion. Modeling themselves after the West to this logical extreme would have been a laughable, grotesque farce. The so-called intellectuals apart, the ordinary Japanese never forgot that their century-long movement toward "civilization and enlightenment" was at the same time a century-long movement to "expel the barbarians." The powers and circumstances surrounding Japan did not allow the Japanese to forget this fact even temporarily.

The Roots of the Pacific War

The Western powers' advance into Asia was not a temporary phenomenon of the years preceding the Meiji Restoration of 1868. As evidenced in the Triple Intervention, by which Russia, France, and Germany forced Japan to relinquish some of its gains from the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95,* Europe made a continuing issue of its expansionist interests in the Far East. Not long thereafter an additional threat appeared on the scene—that posed by the United States. Having acquired the Philippines in the Spanish-American War of 1898, the American forces suppressed an independence movement, killing, according to some, one-sixth of the Philippine population. The U.S. annexation of Hawaii also occurred in 1898, and Secretary of State John Hay proposed the Open Door policy for China in 1899.

The drive to the west had brought Americans to their west coast. After a brief pause, they began moving farther west, this time across the Pacific. The earlier European thrust into the Far East that had so frightened the Japanese of the late Tokugawa period exhausted its energies on India first and then Southeast Asia and China, so it had run out of steam by the time it reached Japan. Now, however, the United States was on the move, and its thrust seemed to be aimed directly at Japan. Eventually a direct U.S. blow on Japan was to be struck with the July 1941 embargo on oil shipments to Japan and the so-called Hull Note from Secretary of State Cordell Hull in November, which demanded among other things that Japan withdraw from China.

---

*The treaty of Shimonoseki, signed in April 1895, ended the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95. The treaty recognized Korea's independence of China and ceded Formosa (Taiwan) and the Liaotung Peninsula to Japan. But later that month Russia, France, and Germany informed Japan of their concern over the prospect of the Liaotung Peninsula's being transferred to Japan and "advised" its return to China. Japan, exhausted by the war with China and faced with the threat of forcible resistance by at least one of the powers, Russia, was forced to yield to this demand.—Ed., *Japan Echo*.

Information on Japanese-American relations on the eve of Pearl Harbor was concealed after the war, and only recently have people begun to talk. It has been revealed, for instance, that Washington had no intention of seriously negotiating in the talks held immediately prior to the war. It has even been claimed that President Franklin D. Roosevelt had foreknowledge of and anticipated the Japanese navy's supposedly secret attack. The essential point, however, is not to solve the mystery of whether or not Roosevelt laid a trap for Japan. A more important need is to comprehend the overall design of America's Pacific maneuvering.

Hayashi pinpoints the beginnings of the Pacific War in the immediate aftermath of the 1905 Portsmouth conference concluding the Russo-Japanese War. "This may strike many readers as an arbitrary or forced interpretation," he cautions, but a comprehensive view of world history shows his interpretation to be a logical, even conservative, conclusion. Going back further, we might even treat the Spanish-American War as the beginning of the Pacific War, since from that time onward two powers faced each other across the Pacific Ocean.

The next question is whether or not open conflict between these two powers was inevitable. The period after the Russo-Japanese War, some people argue, may have been the last point at which the Pacific War could have been prevented. This interpretation holds that perhaps confrontation could have been avoided had Japan accepted railway baron Edward H. Harriman's proposal to join American interests with Japanese interests in Manchuria. In a time of conflict, runs this theory, the small Japanese nation on the edge of the Pacific, facing the Eurasian continent, was forced to ally itself either with Britain and the United States or with Russia. Since an Anglo-American alliance seemed more stable and reliable than a Russian one, Japan's strategy should have been to promote harmonious relations with Britain and the United States. By its rejection of Harriman's proposal, however, Japan weakened these ties, thereby choosing the road that led to the Pacific War.

Certainly from the standpoint of a single country or from a present-day analysis of strategies, this view seems correct. Further support can be found in the fact that Britain and the United States in those days had no designs on Japan, their interest instead lying in China. But just because Japan then had the opportunity to conclude an Anglo-American alliance does not mean that Japan should have concluded such an alliance. Such a decision would have been too narrowly nationalistic.

Japan did not fight for 100 years merely to protect its own borders. Had this been the case, later generations would clearly understand the reasons for such a defensive war. But in the long war fought by Japan, protection of its own boundaries was a minor issue. (This may be one reason the dispute over the Soviet-occupied "northern territories" today also seems to lack urgency.) National boundaries have grave significance only between countries belonging to the same cultural sphere. Japan's struggle was for something more urgent and essential than national boundaries; its cultural sphere was threatened.

Fighting the Wrong Enemy

Today, since the great cultural sphere of Asia is not directly threatened, we fail to appreciate just how crucial the sphere is to Japan. Thus, when confronted with such grand visions as that of Tenshin Okakura, who expatiated on a conflict between Asia and the West, we tend to regard them as outdated or too generalized. Listening to many of the recently popular theories of Japanese character, one might think that Japan constituted a cultural sphere in itself. In earlier time, however, facing an imminent crisis in the entire Asian cultural sphere, the Japanese must have strongly sensed that their own survival was endangered should that cultural sphere be destroyed. When immediately threatened, people have no difficulty identifying their true lifelines.

Considering that Asia in those days was being choked by the West, one can easily imagine the Japanese people's reluctance to be drawn into an Anglo-American alliance or to team up with Russia. This was literally unthinkable. Had Japan made such an alliance, there would have been no answer to the inevitable scathing criticism heaped on Japan from other Asian countries. The postwar strategy cannot be applied to the past. Even though the British and Americans were not directly attacking Japan at the time, as long as they continued to be oppressors in Asia, confrontation with Japan was inevitable.

We did not fight for Japan alone. Our aim was to fight a Greater East Asia War. For this reason, the war between Japan and China and Japan's oppression of Korea were all the more profoundly regrettable, inexpressibly tragic events. Had Japan invaded China and Korea for its own benefit in thoughtless imitation of the West, this would not call for abject, prostrate apology. Japan merely would have been copying a normal mode of behavior in international society, where survival of the fittest is the law. Most countries would not even consider apology in such a case. Since Japan's actions were not of this variety, however, today we can only face China, and especially Korea, with bitter regret.

To be sure, varying interpretations of Japanese activities are possible. For instance, the political ideals behind the actions and the realities of the actions may be branded inconsistent. In spite of the clearly anticolonialist ideals of the instigators of the takeover of Manchuria, the actual management of Manchuria was colonialist—an example of the gap between ideal and reality seen everywhere.

Another possible interpretation is that just as Japan's vision was clouded by the prospect of immediate profit, so China and Korea, newly awakened to the forces of nationalism, overreacted to the immediate Japanese threat in disregard of the major enemy. Those who tried to awaken their compatriots to the major enemy were branded traitors and died unrewarded. In any society those with unusual foresight and perception tend to be unappreciated. Yet we cannot but regret their treatment.

The American role must not be forgotten. Since nothing pleases war strategists more than division in enemy ranks, the United States supported the Chinese Nationalist government with loans and weapons in its war against Japan. That such aid was given on strictly humanitarian grounds is an interpretation straining belief.

After all is said and done, however, the reality remains that Japan went into the Asian continent to save it but ended up fighting against it. Hayashi does not evade this reality, nor does he attempt to rationalize or defend it. He simply grieves over it and sees in it the "coldheartedness of history." Abjectly apologizing to neighboring countries without appreciating coldhearted history is sheer sycophancy. The kind of people who engage in such conduct are those most likely to repeat past mistakes.

Was "Liberation of Asia" Mere Demagoguery?

In the face of coldhearted history, minor controversies like last summer's uproar over the appropriateness of the word *invasion* in school textbooks seem petty. The essential point is an accurate understanding of the crisis that threatened all of Asia and the actions of Japan in response to that crisis. If we wish to accuse the Japanese of an invasion, then revision should begin with accounts of Columbus's discovery of America in 1492, renaming it "the first step in the invasion of the New World." After such changes, we would recognize how few movements in history are *not* invasions. We would also realize that labeling Japan's engagements in China and Korea invasions is a gross oversimplification.

Japan's actions in Southeast Asia are more easily understood. To these peoples, familiar with Western power through their direct experience as colonies under white domination, the mutual enemy appeared more clearly than it did to the Chinese and Koreans. The collaboration with Japan by Subhas Chandra Bose of India, Ba Maw of Burma, and Jose Laurel of the Philippines, as well as the Thai participation in the war, evidence a keen awareness of the need somehow to break free of white domination.

The Japanese troops were not dispatched southward as messengers of friendship and amity, however, but as combatants in a life-or-death struggle. Consequently, many Southeast Asians were alienated by the harsh Japanese actions. In addition, the Allied forces naturally drafted natives of their colonies into military service, so that Japanese and Southeast Asian soldiers often found themselves facing each other on the battlefield. Had Japan's southern advance been less of a blitzkrieg (for Japan itself as well), there might have been time to lay ample foundations for a "war of Asian liberation." Japan, however, was unable to control the timing and scale of the fighting, and even the question of war or peace was outside its control.

The decision to wage war made by the General Staff Office of the Imperial Headquarters was a reaction to the American embargo on oil shipments to Japan. Washington made this decision when its own war preparations had reached an advanced stage. In other words, the decision to fight was made neither by the Imperial Headquarters nor by the emperor but by the American government. As the United States advanced its pawns across the board, Japan was doing its best merely to keep up. Far from conducting the Greater East Asia War according to some blueprint, Japan was not even allowed time to draw up a blueprint. That Japan was forced into the fight with much of Asia still on the other side is a source of infinite regret.

Did our Greater East Asia War really result in total defeat? The former colonies that became battlegrounds all gained their independence during or after the war, and they have not fallen into white hands again. What are we to make of this fact? In the postwar years we were taught that this was an incidental byproduct of that detestable war. Yet as Japan's official statements on war objectives make clear, the goal was to free East Asia from British and American domination and establish the area's self-defense and independence. Again, if one asks Japanese war veterans why they fought, the reply comes that they believed they were fighting to liberate Asia. And indeed, Asia was liberated. It is a curious logic that denies any connection between this purpose and the war's outcome. Is history so difficult that it can only be understood through such a strange logic?

Applying this logic to the American Civil War will illustrate its distortion. It is generally recognized that the Civil War was fought not merely over the slavery issue but also over fundamental economic differences between the North and the South. Northern soldiers objected to having to die for the "niggers," but they fought nonetheless because other issues were involved. Even Lincoln's renowned Emancipation Proclamation was motivated by a hope to stimulate domestic and foreign support for the embattled

Northern troops and to enhance the Northern position. Yet nobody today, except possibly some people in isolated regions of the Deep South, would maintain that the Emancipation Proclamation was an empty farce and that the concept of freeing slaves was foisted on the common people by a prowar Yankee faction attempting to cover up its invasion of the South. Nobody would cry out against the loss of young lives as a result of such demagoguery and insist that militarism must never again be permitted. Why is this interpretation so unpopular? Because the North won the war.

But Japan lost, and defeat included denial of the ideals for which the losers fought as well as denial of their accomplishments. This was simply the inverse of "might makes right."

Why is it that people do not look at history honestly? Such honesty is what Hayashi means by calling for "affirmation" of the Greater East Asia War. His sole contention throughout the book is that we should accept things for what they are. Underlying his hope that truth will prevail is his concern for the next generation. What will result if those responsible for building the postwar world do so in willful disregard of the realities of the past? Hayashi is pessimistic about a generation brought up to consider itself a product of "nothingness." We ought not to deny the validity of his concern.

The Emergence of Japanese Supernationalism

We should ask one more simple question that Hayashi never addresses. Why, in this postwar period, do we so resolutely refuse to face obvious reality? This is not a rhetorical question. Contained in the answer is a mystery and paradox of Japanese thought. Without the answer to this question, we cannot theorize about the nature of the Japanese people.

Why for so long after the war have the Japanese insisted that they alone were in the wrong, causing them to brand as peculiar all the arguments of people like Hayashi who see the fighting for what it was? One easy answer is that the seven years of occupation and censorship implanted this mindset. Another quick response is that communist propaganda is to blame. Throughout Japan's long history, the Japanese may have appeared to accept foreign doctrines without protest, but the truth is that they have never really accepted any way of thinking that threatened their traditional values. (The failure of Christianity to take root is a good example of this.) If the unreasonable condemnation of the Greater East Asia War posed a true threat to what we call *Yamato damashii*, or the Japanese spirit, then the Japanese would have soon dismissed whatever the U.S. occupation authorities or the Kremlin said about the war.

If now, 30 years after the occupation, the Japanese continue to reiterate assertions originally made by the occupation authorities, may not the reason be that on some unconscious level these assertions reflect a basically Japanese way of thought? Hayashi does not carry his argument this far. He simply laments the "dementia of the defeated." However, he misses one small fact. He states, "I forget which politician coined the slogan '100 million people united in repentance,' but undoubtedly he was of the same lineage as the politicians who, during the war, used the slogan '100 million people united in outrage.' " The dementia of the defeated, he insisted, is evident in the former slogan. The author of the slogan, however, was none other than General Kanji Ishihara, one of the prewar figures like the nationalists Shumei Okawa and Ikki Kita whom Hayashi holds in high esteem in his book. Ishihara was not cringing before the Allies by using this expression. He was not apologizing for having helped cause the war. He was suggesting that the responsibility for defeat should be shared by the entire nation.

Did everyone simply misunderstand what Ishihara was proposing? Let us consider the thinking that led to his view. Underlying his concept of national repentance was regret over the uncharacteristic behavior that the Japanese were forced into during the century beginning with the demise of the Tokugawa regime [1868]. The true tragedy of the 100-Year East Asia War was that "expulsion of the barbarians" was possible only through deliberate westernization. Asian nations like the Indian Mogul Empire and the Chinese Ch'ing Empire that proudly maintained their own cultures were toppled by Western power. Japan realized that only through discarding traditional Japanese qualities could it preserve its independence and culture. In other words, Japan chose to preserve bushido, "the way of the warrior," by shearing the samurai's topknot.

Even more fundamental and less apparent in this process of westernization, the Japanese began to subscribe to the characteristically Western world view of dividing nations into friends and foes, of recognizing foes as enemies, and of behaving antagonistically toward enemies. By accepting this confrontational world view, Japan barely managed to sustain itself through several crises. This may have been an inevitable way for Japan to proceed, but it was nonetheless regrettable. Thinking in this way, Ishihara made the following declaration concerning Japan's new Constitution: "When either the Americans or the Soviets press for Japan's rearmament sometime in the future, we must never submit to this request no matter how powerful the pressure."

After the war, sensing the passing of a crisis, the Japanese felt that they could finally be themselves. They did not misinterpret

Ishihara's slogan. Instead they took to heart the message that underlay it.

The Japanese determined never again to take up residence in the violent Western-style international community. No matter how much power was being brandished or what enemy was making threats, they decided, they would turn a blind eye. Should a dispute occur, they would attribute it to their negligence or handle it as a misunderstanding. They refused to view the world in any other way. This "peaceful world view" adopted by each individual Japanese is the heart of a characteristically Japanese way of thought. It is a true form of supernationalism. Based on this philosophy, postwar Japan's energy was wholly directed toward reconstruction rather than toward revenge.

Japanese Folk Wisdom

What Hayashi sees as the dementia of the defeated is actually the natural sagacity of the Japanese. One aspect of this folk wisdom lies in the fact that its possessors are themselves unaware of it. The Japanese fail to realize that when trade friction occurs or a textbook controversy breaks out, their policy of simply offering apologies left and right amounts to a firm expression of Japanese nationalism.

Perhaps the unconscious quality of this folk wisdom is even its salient characteristic. The moment that we become aware that it is a form of nationalism, it will lose its folk quality. This is because the "peaceful world view" is based not on assertiveness but on acceptance of outside views. The view would not hold up were it to become an ideological creed. That is, the quality of the peaceful world view would be substantially altered were Japan to turn this view into an ideology and announce it as an article of public faith. Yet the Japanese cannot abandon the peaceful world view and docilely accept one of the confrontational views popular in other countries, which see the world as an area of powers balanced against and clashing with other powers, for these views run contrary to the Japanese spirit.

In the postwar period, the Japanese have managed to sustain this precarious outlook that the rest of the world shares our peaceful world view and that Japan is simply drifting safely within the confines of such a view. So convinced, we can espouse the peaceful world view not as a Japanese assertion but as an article of universal faith. This is indeed an elegant answer to the predicament posed to the Japanese outlook.

The preamble to the Constitution provides the classic statement of this ideal state subscribed to by the Japanese. "We, the Japanese people, desire peace for all time and are deeply conscious of the high ideals controlling human relationship, and we have determined to preserve our security and existence, trusting in the justice and faith of the peace-loving peoples of the world. We desire to occupy an honored place in an international society striving for the presevation of peace, and the banishment of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance for all time from the earth. . . . We believe that no nation is responsible to itself alone, but that laws of political morality are universal; and that obedience to such laws is incumbent upon all nations. . . ."

What is expressed here is precisely Japan's peaceful world view. International society is supposedly founded upon sympathy for others and mutual friendly relations. It is not the bloody arena directly experienced by Japan throughout the 100-year war. Nor is it the world today, where battles still rage to banish "tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance." Japan withdrew from such a world, redefined the meaning of international society so that it would not conflict with the Japanese spirit, and declared its intention to dwell peacefully in the community thus created.

The supernationalist ideology outlined in the Constitution is a key national principle in addition to the emperor system. Anyone questioning this ideology is considered unpatriotic. Nevertheless, the actual circumstances under which the Constitution was written were far from the "international society" it presupposes. The overriding purpose in its drafting was to prevent the defeated country from ever again rising to threaten the victor. In short, the hope was to subjugate the Japanese. Japan's desperate, all-out struggle to fend off subjugation finally succeeded in reducing the threat to Japan to the form taken by the Constitution. Yet we not only fail to pay proper respect to our predecessor's struggle; we are not allowed even to remember that it occurred. People subconsciously fear that recognition of this reality may somehow rupture their dream of a peace-loving world.

There is one major and critical difficulty in this adept evasion of reality. This is that regardless of Japan's own slant on the nature of the international society in which it sees itself as living, a majority of the world's people have adopted a different slant. They still view international society entirely in terms of power and treat Japan as just one more player in the power game. Japan's plight is that it must live as if it were completely unaware that others calculate all their moves on the basis of power—in fact, it must work actively to remain ignorant of such calculations. And when Japan unintentionally creates power or a power vacuum by its own actions, the Japanese can only wait in anxious suspension for the repercussions in the power equations of other countries. Recent cases of trade friction are one small example of this.

Understanding Ourselves

"We, the Japanese people . . . have determined to preserve our security and existence, trusting in the justice and faith of the peace-loving peoples of the world," runs the preamble to the Japanese Constitution. Yet in other countries, justice, faith, and love of peace are perceived to be conditions that move to the fore or recede depending on the results of calculations of power. Without understanding these calculations, we stake our own security and existence on them. Even the boldest gambler would pale and tremble at a gamble of this magnitude. Japan, however, is accepting this gamble without so much as the twitch of an eyebrow.

We should not simply dismiss the peace-loving world view of the Constitution as illusion and affirm that the only realistic world view sees power in conflict with power. If our international society is an illusion, the confrontational world is no less so. Like our premise, the premise of inevitable antagonism between opposing forces cannot be proven. The only certainty is that we live in a world in which Japan has its characteristic illusions and other countries have theirs. We can no longer close our eyes to this truth, for to do so is fraught with danger.

The day when we could protect our identity by closing our eyes is ending. It is time that we opened our eyes, learned about ourselves, and grappled in earnest with the problem of preserving our identity. The popularity over the last dozen years of various theories of Japanese character is evidence that people have begun to sense that this problem is an important one. As yet, however, people are not certain what they should be looking for. Theories of Japanese character are being bandied about in the fashion of children playing with building blocks—tossing and chewing the blocks without creating any structure.

Who are we? How can we be ourselves? In order to make these simple questions meaningful, we must once more review the significance of the war. In Japan's long history, only during this 100-year period was it necessary to wage war to preserve our identity. In order to wage this war, inevitably we were made increasingly aware of this identity. The climactic and concluding phase of that struggle in particular must be candidly reassessed. Only when we fully understand what lay at its depths will we be able to deny that "holy war," the Greater East Asia War, and truly begin anew.

This article first appeared in *Chuo Koron,* April 1983, and then, in translation, in *Japan Echo,* Vol. XI, Special Issue, 1984. Reprinted with permission of *Japan Echo,* Moto Akasaka Bldg., 1-7-10 Moto Akasaka, Minato-ku, Tokyo 107, Japan.

*The Psychology and Epistemology of 'Holocaust' Newspeak**

MICHAEL A. HOFFMAN II

"Holocaust" is a Newspeak word whose exact definition exists, in the society of the spectacle, as a bundle of images. It is recognized on the visceral rather than the rational plane by its targeted audience. It does not exist in the public mind as a specific event, but as a command phrase summoning a sensory overload of images of piles of naked bodies and persons with stars of David on their coats being force-marched by gun-toting German soldiers. How can any person say it didn't happen?

When Abba Eban's *Civilization and the Jews* TV series installment on the "Holocaust" omitted any mention of homicidal gas chambering—the central event of the history of Exterminationism—there was no apparent notice or comment among critics or the public. It was as if NASA had produced a mini-series on the moon flights without mentioning the rockets that carried the astronauts, and no one even noticed.

The spectacular "Holocaust" has the quality of a myth because it has an existence independent of its history.

Specific descriptions of a variety of actions, events and principals having tremendous diversity in significance and meaning have been absorbed into a single, narrow category. Prior to the imposition of "Holocaust" Newspeak, precise allusions and direct references were made to the allegations at issue, as for example, the claim of six million slaughtered Jews, mass murder by means of poison gas, soap manufactured from human fat and so forth.

---

*Chapter one from the author's forthcoming book, *The Highest Degree of Sacredness: The 'Holocaust' Cult in Theory and Practice.*

Now, under the aegis of "Holocaust" Newspeak, the preceding *allegations* are combined into an aggregate which includes the *reality* of National Socialist internment of Jews in concentration camps, the "Kristallnacht," an officially enshrined policy of anti-Semitism and the displacement and death of hundreds of thousands of Jews as a result of war-related combat, typhus and privation. Which are upheld and which are denied when one is accused of saying "the 'Holocaust' didn't happen"?

The masterstroke of the "Holocaust" cultists was to impose a Newspeak slogan upon a combination of historical realities and historical impostures, thereby achieving a psychological and epistemological device for condemning researchers skeptical of homicidal gas chambering accounts or human skin lampshades as deniers of the existence of concentration camps, Hitlerian anti-Semitism and persecutions; and the death and displacement of hundreds of thousands of European Jews.

By exploiting this confusion, the Exterminationists can depict persons who question even the wildest flights of "Holocaust" S&M fantasy as lunatic nay-sayers to the spectacular, overwhelming enormity of an entire era's history when conveniently grouped under the Newspeak heading.

The utility of Newspeak for the maintenance of an indoctrinated mindset is glimpsed in the intriguingly stubborn affinity many journalists have for the "Holocaust" Newspeak agenda. With comical monotony, reporters refuse to describe revisionists in terms of the specific question they have about a specific event. Instead, both the event and the questioner are located within the artificial agenda of "Holocaust" Newspeak. By continually referring to a researcher who doubts the technology described for the Nazi gas chambers, for example, as one who "says the 'Holocaust' didn't happen," the doubter is cleverly saddled with the enormous connotations which are summoned in the public mind by the invocation of a Newspeak buzz word. Suggesting that gas chamber accounts might have been faked requires the logical defense of that particular assertion. Being presented to a conditioned audience as someone who says the "Holocaust" is a fake, is tantamount to being announced as one who proclaims a flat earth. As in any cult, the doubting Thomas is not addressed in terms of his specific doubts but as one who negates an entire cosmology.

Newspeak obscurantism produces an iconic mental state among the "Holocaust" cult's true believers which is indistinguishable from that of the hypnotic because, "Newspeak was designed not to extend but to diminish the range of thought." (George Orwell, *1984*).

The imposition of "Holocaust" Newspeak as the officially proper academic and journalistic term for German-Jewish relations for the period from 1933–1945 is a recent innovation. As late as 1977, the "Holocaust" word was written in the lower case, within quotation marks ("holocaust"), when used as an optional reference to the experience of Jews in the Third Reich. In the middle of the decade of the 1970's, dictionaries, encyclopedias, textbooks and newspaper indexes were altered to incorporate Newspeak, without any qualifiers, in accordance with the demands of the Big Brother Exterminationist party.

Webster's Dictionary and Encyclopedia and the *Funk and Wagnall's Dictionary* of the 1960's define holocaust as a burnt offering on the part of pagans and Jews. By 1975, however, "minitrue" has entered the *New Columbia Encyclopedia,* which now defines holocaust as "a name given to the period of persecution and extermination of European Jews by the National Socialists, or Nazis."

A name given by whom? By whose authority was the *fact* of persecution mixed together with the *notion* of "extermination"? Who decided on this word's authoritative application? How did it enter popular usage? Why "Holocaust" with its nebulous reference to reality (anti-Semitic persecution) as well as disputed claims (extermination)? Why wasn't the word "Exterminationism" chosen for official, dictionary-definition recognition? The latter term accurately denotes a specific allegation, that the Jewish people were "exterminated" during World War II. Such a word does not depend upon ambiguous connotations or confusing allusions to disparate events for its utility and validity. To be accused of denying Exterminationism does not place the denier in the position of a flat earthist nonsensically denouncing the massive evidence of concentration camp internment and Jewish casualties. To deny Exterminationism is to deny that Jews were in fact exterminated. This is not much of a denial since millions of Jews were alive at the end of the war.

The novocaine of the media ensures that no one asks these reasonable and obvious questions. Linguists of the caliber of Noam Chomsky and Orwell pontificators of the stature of Cronkite and Moyers, accepted and even endorsed the issuance of a license akin to the ecclesiastical *imprimatur* for use as the exclusive referrent of one nation of people.

Was World War Two itself a holocaust over-all, or does the term have a proprietary relationship with Jews alone? How is it that the atomic and thermite incineration of approximately one million helpless German and Japanese civilians, mostly women and children, in deliberate mass murder firebombings by the Allied air forces, does not rate as a holocaust?

Revisionists are forced to endure from the Exterminationists a particularly chilling and grotesque example of self-aggrandizement when revisionists are accused of denying a World War Two holocaust.

The overwhelming holocaust of the modern era, for which there is all of the forensic proof the Jewish "Holocaust" is supposed to contain and from which it is also intended to distract, is the merciless Allied fire-bombing holocaust against Hamburg, Berlin, Dresden, Tokyo, Hiroshima, Nagasaki and *dozens* of other major civilian centers.

The racism of the ethnocentric "Holocaust" cult is confronted full force in the special criterion established for the phrase "Holocaust survivor." Such people are always the victims of the National Socialists and are mostly Jews. Human perception has been so impaired by this cult category that Germans and Japanese who escaped death in the unprecedented firestorms which transformed their cities into pits of mass human incineration, are not referred to as holocaust survivors.

A media-certified Jewish "survivor" of the one and only "Holocaust" with a capital H symbolizes the pathetic partisanship with which the entire epoch of the holocaust that was World War Two as a whole is invested.

Revisionists do not deny the holocaust in the fully human sense of that word. Let the TV cameramen and the professors focus their attention on the mass burning of hundreds of thousands of women and children in deliberate Allied slaughters, and they too will come to realize the degree to which Zionist racism and hatred of gentiles has suppressed this holocaust to such a degree that it is totally dismissed from discussion of the history of the Second World War.

Hence, when revisionists question this or that aspect of the *Sho'ah* theologian's theory about an expiational Jewish inferno, it signals to the cultist that "the 'Holocaust' didn't happen." The logic of the "Holocaust" zealot permits the visualization of only Jewish suffering; only Jews burning. If one says the gas chamber canon is questionable, contradictory, possibly false, it must then signify that one is saying the war was a picnic! The cultist is incapable of understanding that German and Japanese civilians suffered an unparalleled holocaust in World War Two which is not being denied when revisionists investigate Jewish claims; on the contrary, it is freed for the first time from an imposed silence.

It is from a desperate need to take world attention away from the authentic "burnt offerings" of that horrid war that the traumatizing monomania of Jewish "Holocaust" preoccupation has warped the conscience of the West.

Mt. Zion decrees, "The 'Holocaust' cannot be debated" and in a sense this theological fiat is quite true. In free and open debate, linguistic mystification would no longer shield partisan generalizations and falsehoods. Charges and assertions would have to stand on scientific and forensic evidence alone. The diminishment of thought Orwell pointed to with regard to Newspeak is noted in the current circumstances surrounding investigation into the numerous contradictions, discrepancies and outright absurdities in the claims made about homicidal gas chambers. There are many aspects of the gas chamber claims which deserve—even demand—critical, scholarly analysis. Authentically sound historiography does not shrink from such scrutiny but assists it with all the resources available. Truth need not be protected beneath a shower of fascist-baiting expletives and left-wing McCarthyist smears about "anti-Semitism." Truth welcomes every investigation and every manifestation of curiousity. In so vast a study as the Jewish "Holocaust" claims can it really be truthfully asserted that everyone troubled by contradictions or questionable methods and testimony is *ipso facto* a fiendish Jew-hater?

"Holocaust" Newspeak offers ample protection for hoaxes through its suppressive linguistic mechanism. "Holocaust" belief diminishes critical thinking because its authority is not derived from having stood the traditional tests of point-counterpoint debate and rigorously critical exegesis, but from a ruling class monopoly-consensus possessed of the ability to propound dogmatically before large captive audiences.

The remarkable fact about the attack on revisionism by the Exterminationist historians is that it has had very little to do thus far with history, but everything to do with angry invective and Jewish moralizing.

Those who possess the authority to impose upon our discourse partisan jargon disguised as objective historical description have a tremendous impact on the shaping of human perception, an impact thus far overlooked in the study of the evolution of our beliefs about the history of the Second World War.

In modern democracies we are supposedly encouraged to question everything, from traditional religions revered by our grandparents to the infinite themes of space and time, but no "respectable" person is permitted by the establishment to question how this "Holocaust" buzz-word came to be applied, in its capitalized form, uniquely to the situation of Jews in the Third Reich.

The West, in its penultimate secular-consumer phase, wishes to uphold the concept that it alone among contemporary and historical social and cultural models, has no sacred dogmas or theology and therefore no forbidden domains of intellectual inquiry and no heretics.

As we shall see, Exterminationism (an accurate description for the ubiquitous conspiracy theory regarding Jews and National Socialists), is as much of a sacred cow in North America and

Europe as Islam in Iran, Marxism-Leninism in Albania or the Holy Ghost revival in Skunk Hollow, Tennessee.

Just as atheists and pagans were executed for denying the existence of the devil in the 17th century, revisionists are candidates for burning in the 20th century for denying the devil theory of modern European history, Exterminationism.

Menachem Begin and other Israeli government officials have described the popular supermarket-tabloid fiend known by the generic brand-name, "Nazi war criminal," as "satanic." This notion of the diabolic presupposes the angelic. The one can do no right, the other can do no wrong. All such witch crazes carry along with their *vapeurs histeriques* the whiff of solicited murder.

The murder of the modern supermarket-satanist, the brand name Nazi war criminal, is a hallmark of "Holocaust" cultism taken to its illogical, but inevitable, conclusion. In February, 1973 Israeli agents beat to death a former German soldier in the mistaken belief he was Dr. Mengele, the witch of Auschwitz and convenient fantasy projection for extant psychoses about Dr. Frankenstein.[1]

In 1982, French witchfinder general Serge Klarsfeld paid a Bolivian assassin $5,000 to murder Klaus Barbie.[2] Despite this "peccadillo," Mr. Klarsfeld continues to receive numerous encomiums from the "humane" and "democratic" media establishment as a noble battler against fascist barbarity. If the thought of nobility somehow clashes in the reader's mind with the barbarous fact of hiring assassins, and the repercussions possible from encouraging this fellow's example by heaping lavish public praise upon him, banish the thought. To do otherwise is to flirt dangerously toward Jew-hating and neo-Nazism. Keep in mind instead that we are dealing here with angels who are above the law and demons to whom we owe nothing; certainly not the rights of man that must always be extended to Zionists under all circumstances.

Witchfinder Klarsfeld has adopted for his personal motto an adage from the Ku Klux Klan. Rather than have a satanist like Barbie walk free, Klarsfeld declared "It is better to have an illegal resolution."

The degree of fervor exhibited in the crusade against devil-Nazis is that of almost total rage. It should come as no surprise that a special category of fiend has been reserved in the Israeli hell for an even worse species of cretin. The lowest rung on the ladder of demonism is occupied by revisionists. Speaking in what the Associated Press described as a rare interview on Israeli army radio, former Prime Minister Begin announced:

> There is an attempt—and even the word satanic cannot describe its evilness—to deny that six million Jews, men, women, and

> children, were led by Nazi Germany and its partners to the pits, to the poison-spewing trucks, to the gas chambers, to the crematoriums.[3]

If assassination and death by beating are reserved for satanic Nazis, what fate do the holy people have in store for those for whom "even the word satanic" cannot describe their evilness—the revisionists?

Like the promulgation of a Papal Bull anathematizing apostate deniers of the existence of the devil—which carried with it threats of execution—the kingdom of the "Holocaust" is upheld by dogmatic Israeli declaration in the authoritative media monopoly, and woe to those who fail to heed it.

Just as there was no material, scientific proof for the existence of the devil, there is no material, scientific proof for the existence of Nazi homicidal gas chambers. There are no autopsies available from any source showing that even one Jew died as a result of Zyklon B (hydrocyanic acid) poisoning, among the millions who are alleged to have been killed in this manner, an esoteric but revolutionary fact clumsily admitted by the prestigious Exterminationist genie, Dr. Raul Hilberg.[4]

The "Holocaust" cult's "proof" of gas chambers depends upon precisely what the medieval witch cult depended upon for its "proof" of the devil: confessions and "eyewitnesses."

These cults do differ in one respect, however. To augment the accounts of the witnesses who smelled the smoke and saw the fire and brimstone of satan, the holy fungus of the rye ergot was administered to create the necessary hallucinatory vision. In our modern, spectacular society the witnesses do not need drugs to report about the "smoke" and the "flames" emitted by the satanic furnaces. They have the marvelous fungus of television to augment their visions.

For example, in the movie *The Wall* giant crematorium "smokestacks" belch massive clouds of evil-looking black smoke and ash. It was scientifically impossible for the crematoria in Auschwitz to emit smoke or ash, according to the builder's patent by Topf and Son. In fact, no crematoria produce these emissions. Cremation technology was devised in the late 19th century specifically for the purpose of suppressing the emissions which accompany open-pit burning. There are no such things as crematorium "smokestacks." Cremation uses heat, not flame for reduction of the corpse into ash and crematorium chimneys emit heat and not smoke or flames.

Because there is no business like *sho'ah* business, these technical facts have not had any influence on the cinematic promoters of the myth. Since cultic true believers do not permit scientific facts to get in the way of religious "truth," and since the majority of Americans are members of the "Holocaust" cult, there is very little impetus for challenging movies like *The Wall.*

These fantasies about giant smoking furnaces are shown repeatedly in 70 mm. and Dolby stereo constituting an intensely hallucinogenic experience.

"You are there, in Auschwitz!"—rather like the increasingly sophisticated video simulators which let us imagine we are piloting a starship past Orion.

The illusion is exceedingly slick. In the case of Exterminationism, repeated exposure to falsified portrayals of the concentration camps shape the "memories" of former internees who did not witness what was depicted in *The Wall*, but after forty years cannot be too greatly faulted for perhaps imagining that they did, after sitting through a lifetime of graphic cinematic retellings of what *they should have seen*, according to the demands of Exterminationist theology.

The Jewish "Holocaust" has all the substance of a Grade B horror flick recalling Swift:

> Methinks when you expose the Scene, Down the ill-organ'd Engines fall; Off fly the Vizards and discover all, How plain I see thro' the Deceit! How shallow! and how gross the cheat . . .[5]

The *benandante* were agrarian mystics whose sorghum and fennel agricultural rites had no connection to the episcopal satan. Their ecstatic shamanism pre-dated the advent of Judeo-Christianity in Europe by several centuries. When, in 1580, the activities of the *benandante* were reported to the witchfinders of Friuli, Italy it was decreed that *benandante* had to have been satanists because there was no mention in the inquisitors manuals, such as the *Malleus Maleficarum*, of a category of benign nature-worshippers.[6]

In the modern witchfinder's manuals such as Charles Higham's *American Swastika* or the appropriately named *Hammer* (of Heretics) magazine published in association with the Zionist *Shmate* society, *Searchlight* in England, the intelligence sheets of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL) and the Simon Wiesenthal Center, revisionists are never perceived as independent thinkers or skeptical inquirers researching "Holocaust" anomalies out of concern for historical integrity, but as satanists, butchers, terrorists, anti-Semites, neo-Nazis and perverts. For example, Lucy S. Dawidowicz, author of *The War Against the Jews,* labels revisionists as "rabid," "neo-Nazi," "crackpot," "paranoid" and "oddball."[7] Elie Wiesel, chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Commission, adds the invectives "spiritually perverted" and "morally deranged" to the list.[8]

Because the *benandante* had no way of presenting their views to the official circles of the Church and literate establishment elite, they were depicted solely from the point of view of their accusers.

The best presentation of the case against the Exterminationist theory, as of this writing, is Dr. Arthur R. Butz's *The Hoax of the 20th Century*, a brilliant tour de force of research and critical analysis. Importing or possessing the book in Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel and South Africa may result in arrest and imprisonment. In the U.S., it is informally banned from college course work, bookstores and most libraries. Those libraries which do stock it usually keep it off the shelves in inter-library loan.

Those who dare to read the book or make it available to students and the public on the civil libertarian basis of the people's right to know and judge for themselves, will be smeared as Nazi sympathizers and persons spreading poison in the community. This *argumentum ad hominem* will be given by bourgeois journalists and academics who have not even read the book, but who are content to accept the infallible word of the "Holocaust" cult's popes and popesses that the book is profoundly demonic.

Without recourse to a fair hearing before the episcopate and aristocracy, the indigenous *benandante* were transformed into the classic Biblical image of satan. Similarly, in the face of modern censorship and repression, grotesque distortions and patent stupidities are presented to 20th century audiences as "what revisionists say." Lucy S. Dawidowicz:

> Butz—an associate professor of electrical engineering and computer sciences—was convinced that all the Jews said to have been murdered were still alive and he undertook to prove it, his expertise in computers no doubt standing him in good stead.[9]

This is what Dr. Butz actually wrote:

> The Jews of Europe suffered during the war by being deported to the East, by having had much of their property confiscated and, more importantly, by suffering cruelly in the circumstances surrounding Germany's defeat. They may have even lost a million dead . . . Himmler was given the power to "act independently upon his own responsibility." Everybody knew that that meant executions of partisans and persons collaborating with partisans. The dirty task was assigned to four *Einsatzgruppen* of the SD . . . the *Einsatzgruppen* must have shot many Jews, although we do not know whether "many" means 5,000, 25,000 or 100,000.[10]

Miss Dawidowicz had apparently not even read the book by the man she is bashing, and does not expect that her readers have or will either.

Elie Wiesel:

> If we are to believe some morally deranged and spiritually perverted pseudo-historians, the Holocaust never took place . . . The Nuremberg trials, the Einsatzkommando trials, the Frankfurt trials were never held . . . There was no Treblinka, there was no Maidanek, there was no Birkenau . . . Northwestern Professor Arthur Butz calls it: "The hoax of the century."[11]

Dr. Butz on Nuremberg:

> First there was the "big trial" conducted by the "International Military Tribunal" (IMT) at Nuernberg immediately after the war. This was the trial of top Nazis Goering, Hess, Ribbentrop et al. which ran from November 1945 to October 1946.[12]

Dr. Butz on Birkenau:

> Thus, on the basis of seniority and also on account of quartering the Auschwitz SS administrative offices, Auschwitz I was indeed the "main camp," but Birkenau, designed for the specific requirements of the Auschwitz operations, was clearly intended as the "principal camp" in terms of inmate accomodating functions.[13]

This skewing of revisionism on the part of "Holocaust" zealots is intended to make it impossible for otherwise intelligent people to break out of one-track, Newspeak-imposed cognition about World War Two. Orwell:

> The purpose of Newspeak was not only to provide a medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits proper to the devotees . . . but to make all other modes of thought impossible. (*1984*).

The quality of demonic heresy projected onto the revisionist witch is a product of the linguistic technology of Newspeak which creates a deliberate blurring of lines of distinction separating the literal from the metaphoric.

The adoption of a brand name mass-marketing sobriquet as the official, literal-academic, as well as Pop-metaphoric description of German-Jewish relations during the National Socialist reign,was a clever psychological and epistemological coup on the part of the Exterminationists. By this ruse, the critical faculties of both the masses as well as the intelligentsia have been occluded. In considering the subject of German-Jewish relations from 1933 to 1945, it has become difficult—if not impossible as, Orwell warned—to perform the basic requirement which ensures the integrity of language and perception, *the ability to make distinctions.*

The Exterminationists exploit the confusion "Holocaust" Newspeak has engendered in its denotative and connotative aspects.

When revisionist studies make specific challenges about, for example, the number of Jews who perished or the technical impossibility of gassings having taken place in the unsealed, wooden door-latched "chambers" on display in Auschwitz as of this writing, they are defended against in terms of the linguistic and visual agenda of the Pop-metaphor of "Holocaust." Investigating any cherished axiom is cleverly interpreted to the public as an across-the-board, flat-earthist negation of a thousand conjured images of body piles, goose-steppers and concentration camp privation.

It is crucial to the Exterminationists that the public fails to grasp the distinction that the Pop-metaphors of the "Holocaust" are capable of interpretation. No revisionist of even minimal standing denies concentration camps, anti-Semitism or the deaths of hundreds of thousands of Jews from disease, hunger and combat.

The objective of the "Holocaust" cult is to ensure that the public does not learn that revisionist research does not deny the Pop imagery but seeks to discover whether the constantly repeated photographs of body piles and other images of Jewish suffering were the result of mass murder by poison gas and deliberate starvation or failed policies of preventive detention and deportation stemming from Germany's defeat in war.

Dr. Thomas Szasz excavates the underpinnings of the confusion between the literal and the metaphoric when he writes: ". . . where the true believer speaks metaphorically but claims that he asserts literal truths . . . heresy may consist in no more than insisting that a metaphorical truth may be a literal falsehood." (*Heresies*).

As a religious metaphor on a par with the mystical utterances of the *Talmud,* the 20th century Jewish "Holocaust" has significance as an article of pious Jewish faith. Recall that equally audacious recitals are a fixture of Jewish religious fervor. In the sacred Hebrew scripture *Talmud,* it is stated that the Romans slaughtered 40 million Jews during the siege of the Israelite fortress of Bar Kokhba.

The Talmudic story, like the gas chamber story, makes for good *de laude martyrum* apocrypha, but bad history. It is not a matter for the public to debate the literal truth of Jewish beliefs. Every religion has a right to its own story. It only becomes a public matter when Jews attempt to establish as criteria for human decency, good citizenship and public morals, the demand that non-Jews must believe Jewish fables and accept them as a matter of scientific historiography.

It is a telling commentary on the modern era that the apocryphal and expiational langauge and agenda of partisan religious dogma has been enthusiastically embraced as the objective description of an entire epoch of world history in public newspapers and airwaves and the lecture halls of secular universities.

It is an apparent, though not widely admitted fact, that Judaism, through the "Holocaust" cult, has become the informal state religion of the West, with the distinction of being the last truly believed religion in the otherwise agnostic West; the end-result of this reactionary hegemony being the same as that of the Big Brother party in Orwell's *1984*, "to extinguish once and for all the possibility of independent thought."

Judaism is of course not unique in this endeavor. "Churchianity" and Islam have mounted similarly ambitious undertakings, which did not prevent certain high-spirited human beings from casting off the mental shackles of those cruelly oppressive hoaxes. It remains to be seen if the especially authoritative superstitions of the Church of the "Holy Hoax"—wedded as they are to the formidable and unprecedented indoctrinating abilities of modern communications technology—will defeat or will be defeated by the empirical investigations and doubts of the infidels of our time, who dare to blaspheme against the sacred *logos* of "Holocaust" Newspeak.

Notes

1. *The Gazette* (Montreal), March 2, 1985, p. B-5.
2. *NY Times*, Jan. 24, 1985, "Lawyer tells of plot on Barbie." On Feb. 26 Barbie was administered poison by the prison physician. The *NY Times* described the assassination attempt as "medication that was apparently given him by mistake" (*NY Times*, Feb. 27, 1985; also cf. *The Spotlight*, March 11, 1985).
3. Israeli army radio broadcast of April 18, 1985.
4. *The Sault Star* (Canada), Jan. 18, 1985, p. A-11.
5. Ode to the Honourable Sir William Temple.
6. Cf. *Night Battles: Witchcraft and Agrarian Cults in the 16th and 17th Centuries.*
7. Lucy S. Dawidowicz, "Lies About the Holocaust," *Commentary*, December, 1980.
8. Elie Wiesel, "What Did Happen to the Six Million?" *Jewish Chronicle*, Nov. 4, 1977.
9. Dawidowicz, op. cit., p. 34.
10. Arthur R. Butz, *The Hoax of the 20th Century*, Institute for Historical Review, 1985, pp. 239 and 197.
11. Wiesel, op. cit., p. 19.
12. Butz, op. cit., p. 18.
13. Ibid., p. 52.

Reprints of the preceeding article are available in pamphlet form for $2.00 each or $1.00 each for 25 or more.

REVIEW ARTICLE

Azriel Eisenberg Presents
THE GREATEST SOB STORY EVER TOLD
(with a Cast of Millions)

L.A. ROLLINS

THE LOST GENERATION: CHILDREN IN THE HOLOCAUST, by Azriel Eisenberg, The Pilgrim Press, 380pp, $17.95, ISBN 0-8298-0498-6.

Azriel Eisenberg strikes again! In *The Journal of Historical Review,* Spring 1983, I reviewed Eisenberg's *Witness to the Holocaust.* Now Eisenberg, Holocaustomaniac *par excellence,* has produced a companion volume to that egregious opus. So here I am, writing a companion review to my earlier one.

Like *Witness to the Holocaust, The Lost Generation: Children in the Holocaust* purports to be a collection of eyewitness accounts of "the Holocaust." But this time these accounts are either by or about those who were 14 years of age or younger during "the Nazi carnage." According to Eisenberg, 1,200,000 of the Nazis' six million Jewish victims were children. And this killing of children is supposed to be the most shocking and terrible part of the Nazis' "bloody work." Thus, a volume devoted entirely to children in "the Holocaust."

In *Witness to the Holocaust,* Eisenberg said (p. 5), ". . . the heart of this book is a compilation of authentic, first-hand, personal, and eyewitness accounts." Similarly, in the introduction to *The Lost Generation,* he says (p. xvii), "The accounts included in this book were chosen from books written by eyewitnesses. . . . Only authentic personal and eyewitness experiences were selected." Eisenberg emphasizes "authentic, first-hand, personal, and eyewitness accounts" because of the emotional impact they presumably will have on his more reverent readers. In *Witness to the Holocaust,* he explained (p. 5):

> The *Sho'ah* [the Holocaust] cannot be intellectualized. To validate this contention, readers are invited to test their emotional reactions to the introductions of the chapters in this book as compared to the first-hand accounts that follow them. To establish any meaningful tie with Auschwitz, the Warsaw Ghetto, the partisans, the martyrs, and the survivors, we must share in their experiences. For this reason, the heart of this book is a compilation of authentic, first-hand, personal, and eyewitness accounts. They will affect your innermost being.

In the introduction to *The Lost Generation*, Eisenberg says of the "authentic personal and eyewitness experiences" that he's selected (p. xvii), "They will enable the reader to share the agony, the physical, emotional and spiritual torment of the martyred children."

Well, reading Eisenberg's "eyewitness" accounts may be a good way for devout Holocaustomaniacs to experience agony and torment. But, being the cold-hearted nitpicker that I am, I wonder if reading them is a good way to find out what really happened to Jewish children under Nazi rule.

For one thing, a number of scientific investigators of eyewitness testimony have concluded that most such testimony is to some degree unreliable. In his anthology, *The Historian as Detective: Essays on Evidence,* Robin W. Winks included (pp. 182-191) an excerpt, concerning the credibility of testimony, from Thomas Spencer Jerome's *Aspects of the Study of Roman History.* Jerome described experiments conducted by Alfred Binet, William Stern and others. For example, here is Jerome's account of an experiment by Stern:

> He had three simple pictures in black and white, which he exhibited for forty-five seconds each to about thirty cultivated adults who immediately wrote down what they had seen in each picture, and thereafter at certain intervals of time again submitted written statements. Such parts of their depositions as they were willing to take oath upon were indicated by underlining. Without going into details, it may be said that the results were not of a nature calculated to give one great confidence in the value of testimony. Error was not the exception, but the rule. Out of two hundred and eighty-two depositions only seventeen were entirely correct; and of these seventeen, fifteen were among statements written down immediately. By the fifth day even, the proportion of misstatements reached about a quarter of all the details submitted. In the depositions containing indications of matters on which the observer was willing to take an oath, only thirteen out of sixty-three failed to contain false statements, to all of which however the witnesses were prepared to swear. Many of these were cases of the introduction of elements which were absolutely absent from the picture. So one student wrote three weeks after the event: "The picture shows an old

> man seated on a wooden bench. A small boy is standing at his left. *He is looking at the old man who is feeding a pigeon. On the roof is perched another pigeon which is preparing to fly to the ground to get its share of food.*" The italicized statements were wholly incorrect: there were no pigeons in the picture. Perhaps the figure of a cat in the scene may have suggested the idea of a bird to the observer.

Jerome explained the significance of such experiments thusly:

> It will appear from these and similar experiments that erroneous testimony was given in simple matters of direct, personal observation by witnesses who were not influenced by any conscious preexisting emotion or prepossession, and who were actuated by a desire to give an exact and truthful narrative. Yet the results were not encouraging. It is evident, as scholars who have conducted or studied such experiments have shown, that good faith, the desire to tell the truth, and the certainty that the testimony is true, as well as the opportunity to secure correct information, and the absence of prepossessions, are far from affording adequate guarantees that the truth will be told. The most honest witness may misstate; the worst may tell the truth. Entirely faithful testimony is not the rule but rather a rare exception . . .

As reported by French psychiatrist Marcel Eck (*Lies and Truth*, Macmillan, 1970, p. 147), Michel Cenac, after studying similar experiments, drew the following similar conclusions about eyewitness testimony:

> 1. Entirely accurate testimony is the exception,
> 2. The witness offers false information with the same assurance that he gives true information,
> 3. Witnesses are inclined to perceive the facts and reconstruct their memory of them in terms of what seems likely to them rather than what they really saw.

Knowing how fallible my own memory is, these conclusions strike me as being entirely plausible. But if eyewitness testimony is commonly unreliable, then it seems fair to assume that eyewitness testimony about "the Holocaust" is commonly unreliable, too. For that matter, eyewitness testimony about "the Holocaust' might even tend to be more unreliable than other eyewitness testimony. According to Gordon Allport and Leo Postman (*The Psychology of Rumor*, Henry Holt, 1947, p. 53), eyewitness testimony is highly unreliable, ". . . especially in conditions where excitement existed during the original perception or in the process of narration. Normal defects of perception, retention, and verbal report are serious enough, but emotional states greatly magnify them." This is certainly a factor influencing some testimony about "the Holocaust."

Regarding the effect of emotional states, Alexander Leighton, writing about the wartime "internment" of the Japanese (*The Governing of Men*, Princeton University Press, 1946), made some interesting and suggestive comments (p. 268):

> Psychiatrists observing patients who are emotionally unwell have long known that when they go into a state of panic they misinterpret ordinary events as horrible threats. The whistle of a distant train becomes a death scream, or two people seen talking together are instantly assumed to be plotting. More than this, it has been seen that patients in panic can become hallucinated and see people coming to attack them who are not there at all, or may smell smoke and gas where none exists. It is more than probable that this happens to otherwise normal individuals when in a state of intense fear, and it may be that those persons in the [Colorado River War Relocation] Center [at Poston, Arizona] who saw non-existent machine guns and their crews during the strike were suffering from such distortions of their senses. In the Detroit riots the police were bothered by people calling up and giving specific details of murders and violence, sometimes said to be going on before their "very eyes," but which actually never occurred. There are similar instances in reports on the behavior of people under stress in war zones. . . .

According to Leighton, when psychiatric patients "go into a state of panic, they misinterpret ordinary events as horrible threats. The whistle of a distant train becomes a death scream." But it just so happens that numerous survivors of Auschwitz-Birkenau have given eyewitness (or should I say "*ear*witness"?) testimony about hearing the screams of people in "the gas chambers." For example, the testimony of Zvi Goldberg, one of Azriel Eisenberg's witnesses in *The Lost Generation*, includes the following (p. 207): "Suddenly the stillness of the night was shattered by the heartrending cries of the victims being forced into the death chambers." But considering how much train traffic there was in the vicinity of Auschwitz-Birkenau, the question arises: Did fearful camp inmates sometimes misinterpret the sound of train whistles as the death screams of people being gassed?

There are other possibilities. Camp inmates may have sometimes heard real screams and mistakenly assumed that they were the screams of people being killed. For example, consider Sarah Cender's eyewitness account of her arrival at Auschwitz, as quoted by Martin Gilbert (*Auschwitz and the Allies*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1981, p. 309):

> Upon arrival we were separated from the males and brought in front of a building where heaps of clothing were lying on the ground. We were ordered to undress quickly and naked we were pushed into a pitch dark chamber (what we naively and hopefully thought to be a bath facility—although no soap or towel were given to us).

> The doors closed behind us. Anxious seconds and minutes passed. Nothing seemed to happen for a while. Only cries and laments and hysterical screams were heard from every corner of the chamber. Some of the women started to cough incoherently, believing being choked by gas. The situation became unbearable. . . .

Eventually, after a bombing raid, the doors were opened and Cender and her companions were ordered out of "the chamber." But how many camp inmates heard their "hysterical screams" and assumed that they were being gassed?

In any case, even some devout Holocaustomaniacs have acknowledged the inaccuracy of some survivor testimony. In a footnote in *The Holocaust and the Historians* (Harvard University Press, 1981), Lucy Dawidowicz writes (pp. 176-177),

> Many thousands of oral histories by survivors recounting their experiences exist in libraries and archives around the world. Their quality and usefulness vary significantly according to the informant's memory, grasp of events, insights, and of course accuracy. . . . The transcribed testimonies I have examined have been full of errors in dates, names of participants, and places, and there are evident misunderstandings of the events themselves.

In his foreword to *Voices from the Holocaust*, a collection of such transcribed oral testimonies edited by Sylvia Rothchild (New American Library, 1981), Elie Wiesel admits (p. 4):

> . . . here and there you will come up against some errors of fact or perception. For example, the revolt of the Birkenau *Sonderkommando* seems to have been undertaken in cooperation with the Royal Air Force. That's what we read in this book. But, this doesn't agree with the findings of historians. . . . The witness remembers a plan that involved the RAF because he undoubtedly heard rumors: every camp was an inexhaustible source of rumors.

Yes, indeed; "every camp was an inexhaustible source of rumors." And, as Allport and Postman pointed out (*op. cit.*, p. 54), "Even firsthand reports are so faulty that they seldom can be trusted in detail. Rumor, being once, twice, or a thousand times removed from eyewitness testimony, is just so much more invalid." This is a point worth emphasizing because, despite Azriel Eisenberg's claims, *The Lost Generation* contains much that is *not* eyewitness testimony but is merely hearsay, rumor, inference, etc. For example, Eisenberg includes (pp. 108-110) a "document . . . written in Polish by a nameless thirteen-year-old boy in April 1944." Eisenberg's nameless "eyewitness," a resident of Warsaw, wrote, "On the very first day that the 'resettlement' program was instituted, my mother, father, sister, and little brother were deported and killed at Treblinka." But this nameless witness was not deported to Treblinka and did not see his family members killed there, so this is not eyewitness testimony. Eisenberg also includes (pp. 138-139) a brief excerpt from Philip Friedman's *This Was Oswiecim*. Among Friedman's revelations is this: "The children were not always liquidated by gas. Dr. Jacob Wollman of Lodz declares that the SS clubbed about five hundred children to death with their rifle butts." Ouch! Of course, this is not eyewitness testimony, since Friedman didn't claim to have seen this particular atrocity. (He didn't even tell us if Dr. Wollman himself claimed to have seen it.) Titling it "THE GAS CHAMBER," Eisenberg has also included (pp. 139-141) an excerpt "From a Memorandum by Mr. Lieberman, September 27, 1945." Mr. Lieberman described in some detail the operations of "the crematorium and the gas chamber" of Birkenau. But, as he himself explained, "We were separated in quarantine but housed together with another working party, which was serving the crematorium and the gas chamber. It is due to this fact that I know how things occurred." Or, as he also wrote, "I have never seen the trolleys for the transport of corpses personally, nor have I seen the ovens operating; but as I have already mentioned, several of the working party, which was serving the gas chambers and ovens, lived with us and have given me all the details." Thus, Mr. Lieberman's account of "the gas chambers and ovens" is hearsay at best. Mr. Lieberman said, "A certain Jacob Weinschein of Paris, who is a survivor of this commando [*Sonderkommando*], is personally known to me." Didn't Jacob Weinschein ever write an eyewitness account of "the gas chambers and ovens" of Birkenau? In any case, Azriel Eisenberg has not given us eyewitness testimony from Jacob Weinschein. Instead he has given us a heap of hearsay from Mr. Lieberman.

Here is some of that hearsay:

> The men and women entered the so-called bathroom and undressed separately to avoid panic. Once they were undressed they entered by separate doors in the central chamber. This chamber could take 3,000 people. The gas was released through sprays of the showers and from bombs which were thrown through apertures designed to allow for that procedure. Death occurred within five minutes. On certain days, when enormous transports arrived at the station of Birkenau, 42,000 people were gassed. Once the gassing process had been completed, the floor of the chamber opened automatically and the corpses fell into the subterranean chamber, where prisoners in charge of extracting the teeth or cutting hair of a certain length, took over. . . . Once the gold teeth had been recovered, the corpses were loaded on to a moving belt and transported to cremation ovens, through subterranean gangways. There were four ovens, a big one and three small ones, which were capable of burning 400 corpses in five minutes. Later on, when the

> number of corpses exceeded the capacity of the ovens, trenches were dug and the corpses thrown in saturated with petrol.

And the cow in the nursery rhyme really did jump over the moon, which is made of green cheese.

Mr. Lieberman's hearsay account of gassings and cremation at Birkenau is a dilly. For one thing, he said that "Once the gassing process had been completed, the floor of the chamber opened automatically and the corpses fell into the subterranean chamber. . . ." But Birkenau crematoria IV and V had no subterranean chambers. Crematoria II and III each had two subterranean "chambers," one of which allegedly was a gas chamber, the other allegedly an undressing room. But these two subterranean "chambers" were on the same level, at right angles to each other. There were no subterranean chambers *underneath* the alleged subterranean gas chambers. So this part of Mr. Lieberman's tale just doesn't fit the facts.

Neither does his statement that "There were four ovens, a big one and three small ones, which were capable of burning 400 corpses in five minutes." There were four crematoria at Birkenau, two larger ones and two smaller ones. The larger ones, II and III, each had 15 ovens, or, as some people put it, 5 ovens with 3 openings each. The two smaller crematoria, IV and V, each had 8 ovens, or 2 ovens with 4 openings each. No matter how you slice it, Mr. Lieberman's testimony about four ovens, a big one and three small ones, is baloney.

As for his claim that those four ovens could cremate 400 corpses in five minutes, that's beyond baloney. According to *Los Angeles Times* staff writer Carol McGraw, "In the cremation process, a body is placed in a furnace and subjected to temperatures of up to 2,000 degrees for two or three hours." (See "Cremation: Boom Brings Controversy," 13 April 1983, Part I, page 24.) At that rate, four ovens might be able to cremate 400 corpses in *50 hours*, not in five minutes.

If four ovens at Birkenau could cremate 400 corpses in five minutes, then, by extrapolation, they could cremate 192,000 corpses in 24 hours! This is preposterous in its own right, and it renders absurd Mr. Lieberman's claim that "Later on, when the number of corpses exceeded the capacity of the ovens, trenches were dug and the corpses thrown in saturated with petrol." If the four ovens could cremate 400 corpses in five minutes and, therefore, 192,000 corpses in 24 hours, then the Nazis would have had to have gassed something like 200,000 or more people a day at Birkenau in order to have exceeded the capacity of the ovens! But even Mr. Lieberman didn't claim that they ever gassed that many people in one day, although his claim that on certain days 42,000 people were gassed far surpasses in magnitude any other such allegation that I recall having seen. All in all, his story just doesn't "add up."

If Azriel Eisenberg really believes Mr. Lieberman's hearsay hokum, then he probably also believes, along with Steve Martin, that robots from Mars are stealing his luggage, and, for his own safety and the safety of others, he probably should not have access to pointed objects, such as pens and pencils, but should only be allowed to write with crayons.

A recurring theme of *The Lost Generation* is the burning alive of children and others by the Nazi beasts at Auschwitz-Birkenau. Variations on this macabre theme can be found in the testimonies of such survivors as Olga Lengyel, Philip Friedman, Halina Birenbaum, Leon Shlofsky and especially Gisella Perl. (See pages 39, 41-42, 139, 161-164, 165 and 204.) In most cases, the tellers of these tales do not explain how they know them to be true, nor do they explicitly claim to have seen these horrendous events with their own eyes. For example, after claiming that there was a policy of killing pregnant women, Gisella Perl wrote (pp. 163-164):

> Then, one day, Dr. Mengele came to the hospital and gave a new order. From now on Jewish women could have their children. They were not going to be killed because of their pregnancy. The children, of course, had to be taken to the crematory by me, personally, but the women would be allowed to live. I was jubilant. . . .
>
> I had 292 expectant mothers in my ward when Dr. Mengele changed his mind. He came roaring into the hospital, whip and revolver in hand, and had all 292 women loaded on a single truck and tossed, alive, into the flames of the crematory.

I'm sure that tossing 292 women, alive, "into the flames of the crematory" was a helluva lot easier said than done. And Gisella Perl did not say that she *saw* this improbable deed done.

However, in two cases, Gisella Perl apparently claimed to be an eyewitness to the burning alive of people. For example, she wrote (p. 161):

> When we first arrived at Auschwitz, children under sixteen, whether boys or girls, were permitted to accompany their mothers to the women's camps. Then, as usual, there came a counter-order, and all children of fourteen, fifteen, and sixteen had to come forward because they were going to be put into a separate children's camp and receive double bread rations. . . .
>
> The boys left first. They were kept in a camp near ours and we were able to watch them exercise from morning till night, tired, weak, and thin—without the double bread rations they were promised. Then one night the most horrible screams woke our camp from its deathlike sleep. We ran to the entrance of the camp and witnessed a sight I shall never forget as long as I live.

> Several black trucks were standing before the entrance of the boys' camp, and a detachment of SS men were throwing the naked, crying, screaming little boys [of fourteen, fifteen and sixteen years of age?] on the trucks. Those who tried to escape were dragged back by the hair [which wasn't shaved off as with other prisoners?], beaten with truncheons, and whipped mercilessly. There was no help, no escape. Neither their mothers nor God could reach out a helping hand to save their lives. They were burned alive in those crematories which killed and smoked incessantly, day and night.

But, even if the rest of this "eyewitness" testimony is true, the last sentence, the crucial one, begs some questions. Did Gisella Perl *see* the trucks take the boys to the crematories? If so, why did she omit to mention that detail? In any case, even assuming the boys were taken to the crematories, did Gisella Perl *see* them burned alive in the crematories? If so, how did she manage this? Did she follow them *into* the crematories to see what happened? Or did the crematories have transparent walls, allowing any interested persons to see what happened inside?

In any case, at least one part of Gisella Perl's testimony is demonstrably untrue, to wit, her claim that the crematories "killed and smoked incessantly, day and night." In 1979, the CIA published *The Holocaust Revisited: A Retrospective Analysis of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Extermination Complex*. In this publication, two CIA photo interpreters, Dino A. Brugioni and Robert G. Poirier, analyzed aerial photographs taken of Auschwitz-Birkenau between April, 1944 and January, 1945. Brugioni and Poirier wrote (p. 11), "Although survivors recalled that smoke and flame emanated continually from the crematoria chimeys and was visible for miles, the photography we examined gave no positive proof of this." Brugioni and Poirier were being diplomatic. But the fact that *none* of the aerial photographs of Auschwitz-Birkenau show smoke or flame coming from the crematoria chimneys constitutes positive *dis*proof of the familiar claim that "smoke and flame emanated continually from the crematoria chimneys." And it constitutes positive disproof of Gisella Perl's particular version of that claim.

But what is the explanation of Gisella Perl's demonstrably false testimony that the crematoria of Birkenau "killed and smoked incessantly, day and night?" Is this merely an instance of the sort of unintentional distortion that often occurs in eyewitness testimony? Or is it an instance of outright, conscious deception?

What? Outright, conscious deception by a "Holocaust" survivor? Is that even possible? Aren't all survivors Semitic saints inherently incapable of lying?

That deception by a "Holocaust" survivor *is* within the realm of the possible has been admitted even by Holocaustomaniac Gitta Sereny. In *The New Statesman*, 2 November 1979, Sereny wrote:

> Personal accounts, such as the recently-published *Dora* . . . are not rubbish in themselves. . . . The problem with books like this is that they are "ghosted" by professional wordsmiths—the French are especially adept—who have neither interest in nor capacity for conveying truth with restraint. It is less the exaggerations than the false emphases and cheap humor which disqualify them.
>
> Worse again are the partial or complete fakes, such as Jean Francois Steiner's *Treblinka* or Martin Gray's *For Those I Loved*. . . .
>
> Gray's *For Those I Loved* was the work of Max Gallo the ghostwriter, who also produced *Papillon*. During the research for a *Sunday Times* inquiry into Gray's work, M. Gallo informed me coolly that he "needed" a long chapter on Treblinka because the book required something strong for pulling in readers. When I myself told Gray, the "author," that he had manifestly never been to, nor escaped from Treblinka, he finally asked, despairingly, "But does it matter?" Wasn't the only thing that Treblinka *did* happen, that it *should* be written about, and that some Jews should be shown to have been heroic?

But, if Martin Gray's "eyewitness" account of the mass extermination of Jews at Treblinka is a fake, then how many other "eyewitness" accounts of "the Holocaust" are fake as well? And, more specifically, how many of the "authentic personal and eyewitness" accounts in *The Lost Generation* are fakes?

I would bet that Shaye Gertner's "authentic personal and eyewitness" account of his ten weeks as a member of the Birkenau *Sonderkommando* is a fake. Here is part of that account (pp. 210-211):

> After being interrogated by the SS, I was taken to Birkenau and assigned to the *Sonderkommando* Field D, barracks 32. There were four hundred men, mostly Jews, some Poles, and a few Germans. Some wore red emblems [political prisoners]; others the usual green [criminals].
>
> During the first few days I didn't go to the ovens, but did housekeeping chores. But then the squad leader Muller appeared and said, "Such a sturdy lad ought to be assigned to a shift." And I started to work on the ovens. The first days were very hard, and I began to wonder how to extricate myself. Our *Kommando* had just plunged into the task. Everyone knew that within three months all of us would be dispensed with and replaced with others.
>
> Our unit consisted of four hundred men, working in two shifts. One oven belonged to us. We were accompanied by orchestral music on our way to work. The SS leader, Dr. Mengele, was our supervisor. He delivered the inmates to the gas chambers. He was followed in rank by Muller, then the Jewish *kapos*, Poles, and Germans. We were generally guarded by five SS men. When new transports of human cargo arrived, people were unaware of just what was in store for them. Before entering the building carrying the sign "Baths," the people had to disrobe completely and received

> a number of their belongings, presumably to be reclaimed later. They got soap and towels for their shower. Then the *kapos* would dash in to beat the unfortunates, to create confusion. During the ensuing commotion, when people trampled over one another, the door of the gas chamber would be thrown open, the prisoners pushed in, and then the door would bang shut after a cylinder of poison gas was flung into the mass.
>
> I worked ten weeks in the *Sonderkommando*. I never entered the gas chamber itself; only *kapos* were admitted there. After the gassing a door in the other side of the chamber would open; there the *kapos* would enter to throw out the corpses. All of us wore rubber gloves and wads of cotton in our mouths. The corpses exuded a pungent odor that could asphyxiate one. Small cars, loaded with forty corpses apiece, would ride along rails that extended from the gas chamber to the oven. The cars disgorged their cargo into the oven, where the bodies were reduced to ashes by electric current in ten minutes. A weak current left the bones intact; a strong current left small heaps. There was an apparatus, known as an exhaust, that blew the ashes into an adjoining pit, where they were piled into barrels by workers, then hoisted by an elevator and ultimately dumped into the Sola River.
>
> The corpses I loaded onto the carts were yellow from the gas. Some of the cadavers had open, glazed eyes, hands holding their mouths, or clutching stomachs. None of us in this work could stand it. We often spoke of escape. (Eisenberg cites *Anthology of Holocaust Literature*, Jewish Publication Society, 1969, pp. 141-147, as his source for Gertner's account.)

According to Gertner, "All of us wore rubber gloves and wads of cotton in our mouths." What excellent safety precautions. A wad of cotton in the mouth beats a gas mask any day. Of course, Gertner and his fellow *Sonderkommando* members simply never inhaled through their noses.

Arthur Butz has written, "The ovens at Birkenau seem to have been coke or coal-fired. . . ." (*The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, Institute for Historical Review, 1976, p. 121.) And a surviving German document, a letter of 29 January 1943, concerning the construction of Crematorium II, said, "The fires were started in the ovens in the presence of Senior Engineer Pruefer, representative of the contractors of the firm of Topf and Soehne, Erfurt, and they are working most satisfactorily." (Butz, p. 116.) But now we know that Butz was wrong and the document forged, because "eyewitness" Shaye Gertner reported that "the bodies were reduced to ashes by electric current."

Gertner's "eyewitness" testimony that the bodies were reduced to ashes "in ten minutes" also discredits the previously-mentioned reportage of Carol McGraw, who said that the cremation of a body takes 2 or 3 hours, not ten minutes.

Another of Gertner's unique revelations: "There was an apparatus, known as an exhaust, that blew the ashes into an adjoining pit, where they were piled into barrels by workers, then hoisted by an elevator and ultimately dumped into the Sola River." Those German barbarians were mighty ingenious, weren't they? But I wonder why they didn't *fully* automate the disposal of the ashes. Surely they could have designed and constructed devices for conveying the ashes directly from the crematoria to the river.

In any case, Gertner said, "We often spoke of escape." And he went on to describe (pp. 211-212) how they planned and then carried out an escape from Birkenau in January 1944, "perhaps the eighteenth day." The leader was a Polish officer whose name Gertner couldn't remember.

> . . . At a signal from the Polish officer, we killed one SS man and threw the German squad leader into the lime pit. Then we began to throw grenades into the oven. Those on the other side of the gas chamber with the other three SS men, who guarded the new arrivals, shouted that it was an air attack alarm. Hearing the explosions, the SS men believed it and ran for cover. The inmates, standing in front of the gas chamber, were at a loss what to do. Meanwhile we fled individually. . . .
>
> An hour and a half went by before the Germans really got their bearings. Then they opened fire in all directions and began to reconnoiter the surrounding area. I learned later from witnesses that about two hundred men were killed in the wake of that event. The rest escaped; it is hard to determine the number killed among the latter.
>
> I was trudging together with a group of twenty-seven men in the direction of Germany. We were led by a Jew from Berlin familiar with the land. We had plenty of money, so we bought shovels and marched along, singing German songs in the manner of German workers. We had already penetrated deep into Germany when we were taken by the German authorities in some town. We declared that we had escaped from a transport in Dachau; they believed us and sent us to Dachau.
>
> I was back in Dachau in March 1944. I said my name was Casiemierz Dudzinski (though they knew I was Jewish).

Thanks to the incredible stupidity and gullibility of their SS guards, Gertner and some other *Sonderkommando* members escaped from Birkenau. So where did they go? Naturally, they headed right into the heart of Germany. What better place to escape the Nazi terror? I'm only surprised that Gertner didn't persuade his inevitable captors that he was Adolf Hitler himself, out for a stroll with his staff. After all, the Germans were apparently willing to believe anything that Gertner and his pals told them.

Although nobody else on Planet Earth seems to know about this revolt and escape of the Birkenau *Sonderkommando* in January

1944, Gertner's story is reminiscent of the tales that have been told of a revolt and attempted escape by the Birkenau *Sonderkommando* on 7 October 1944. However, in that case, none of the prisoners is supposed to have succeeded in escaping. (See, for example, Jozef Garlinski, *Fighting Auschwitz*, Fawcett, 1975, pp. 325-327.)

Speaking of the 7 October 1944 revolt of the *Sonderkommando*, Garlinski (p. 327) names some of those who supposedly were killed in attempting to escape: "Jozef Deresinski, Zalman Gradowski, Ajzyk Kalniak, Lajb Langfus, Lajb Panusz and Josef Warszawski, the leader." Coincidentally, two of these names are mentioned by Azriel Eisenberg on page 141. He writes, "In 1962, in the area of the Birkenau crematorium no. 3, were found the writings of three martyrs, Leib Langfuss, Zalman Leventhal, and Zalman Gradovski." Perhaps these were some of the manuscripts Robert Faurisson had in mind when he referred to "miraculously rediscovered manuscripts" in *Le Monde* on 16 January 1979. In any case, Eisenberg does not tell us how or by whom the writings of the three "martyrs" were found in 1962. But he does tell us, "Langfuss's manuscript was found in a glass jar. In it he explained why the revolt of the *Sonderkommando* had failed." Eisenberg then includes (pp. 141-142) an excerpt from "Langfuss's manuscript" recounting an incident at "the end of October 1944" in which the SS drove a group of children into "the gas chamber" with great brutality and indescribable glee. But, if Jozef Garlinski was correct in writing that Langfuss was among those killed while attempting to escape on 7 October 1944, then how, pray tell, could "Langfuss's manuscript" have "explained why the revolt of the *Sonderkommando* had failed?" And how could it have described events alleged to have taken place at "the end of October 1944?" (This date is quoted from "Langfuss's manuscript" itself.) We seem to be confronted with a miracle similar to the one that enabled Moses to record his own death in verse 5 of Chapter 34 of *Deuteronomy*.

Another of Eisenberg's selections may also partake of the miraculous, to wit, his excerpt from "the diary of Anne Frank" (pp. 76-78). According to Al Fredericks (*The New York Post*, 9 October 1980),

> A report by the German Federal Criminal Investigation Bureau (BKA) indicates that portions of *The Diary of Anne Frank* had been altered or added after 1951, casting doubt over the authenticity of the entire work, the West German news weekly *Der Spiegel* has disclosed. . . .
>
> The results of tests performed at the BKA laboratories show that portions of the work, specifically of the fourth volume, were written with a ball point pen. Since ballpoint pens were not available before 1951, the BKA concluded, those sections must have been added subsequently.

Azriel Eisenberg doesn't mention the BKA's report on "the diary of Anne Frank," let alone try to explain how Anne Frank might have written portions of its posthumously. Instead he devotes pages 355-364 to rebutting revisionism with an excerpt from *The Murderers Among Us: The Wiesenthal Memoirs,* edited by Joseph Wechsberg. According to Eisenberg, this excerpt ". . . illustrates the efforts now being made to rewrite the history of the tragedy, by such individuals as A.R. Butz of Evanston, Illinois, who published an outrageous book, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century,* as well as others in the East, who are issuing a series of tracts entitled *Did Six Million Really Die? The Truth at Last.*" Eisenberg is obviously well-informed about "Holocaust" revisionism (I'm being sarcastic), but his attempted refutation of revisionism from "the Wiesenthal Memoirs" is an excercise in irrelevancy. Confronted by an Austrian boy who disputed the existence of Anne Frank and the authenticity of the "diary," Wiesenthal proceeded to track down the officer who arrested the Frank family. This *may* prove that Anne Frank really existed. But it doesn't prove that she wrote "the diary of Anne Frank." Nor does it explain how it would have been possible for her to write portions of it more than six years after her death from typhus at Belsen in 1945.

Eisenberg immediately follows the irrelevant Wiesenthal excerpt with another response to "Holocaust" revisionism, this one emanating from the West German Federal Supreme Court. In a civil suit in which an injunction was sought against the display of an "offending" poster, the court on 18 September 1979 passed judgment ". . . against a German citizen who exhibited posters stating that the murder of millions of Jews in the Third Reich was a 'Zionist swindle' and the gassing of six million Jews a lie." (I am quoting *Patterns of Prejudice,* January 1980, pp. 32-33.) Eisenberg paraphrases the Court's decision as follows (p. 364):

> On October 29, 1979, the Jewish Telegraphic Association released the news of a landmark decision by the West German Supreme Court which stated that the unique fate of Jews give them a claim to regard and respect from all German citizens, that the Holocaust is part of the consciousness of Jews and it is a matter of their personal dignity to be perceived as the group who suffered persecution and to whom other citizens bear a moral responsibility.
>
> The court said that respect for these feelings had to be regarded as a guarantee for the non-repetition of the past and an essential condition making it possible for Jews to live in Germany. Whoever denies the truth of past events denies to every Jew the respect to which he is entitled, the court declared.
>
> It added that any attempt to justify, to gloss over, or to dispute the facts of the Holocaust shows contempt against every person identified with persecution. Finally, the court affirmed that the evidence of the facts of the Holocaust is overwhelming.

There are a couple of discrepancies between the court's decision, as quoted by *Patterns of Prejudice*, and Eisenberg's paraphrase of it. Eisenberg says, ". . . the court affirmed that the evidence of the facts of the Holocaust is overwhelming." But *Patterns of Prejudice* quoted the court as saying, "The documentary evidence on the extermination of millions of Jews is damning." Similar, but different. Also, Eisenberg says the court spoke of other citizens owing Jews "a moral responsibility." But *Patterns of Prejudice* quoted the court as speaking of "a normal responsibility." Otherwise, though, Eisenberg's paraphrase of the court's ruling is reasonably accurate.

But Eisenberg's invoking of the authority of the West German Federal Supreme Court does not refute "Holocaust" revisionism. As W. Ward Fearnside and William B. Holther have written, "An authority must be *qualified as an expert* in the field in which he is cited." (*Fallacy: The Counterfeit of Argument*, Prentice-Hall, 1959, p. 85.) This means that, "The authority is expressing an opinion within the field of his special competence. Einstein may have held very worthy opinions on world peace, but he was not to be regarded as an expert on international relations just because of his reputation in physics." (*Op. cit.*, p. 86.) By the same token, the West German Federal Supreme Court is not to be regarded as an expert on historical matters just because of its presumed expertise in matters judicial.

Eisenberg's appeal to the authority of the court is an instance of the fallacy sometimes known as "argument from authority." This was one of the fallacies referred to by Fearnside and Holther when they wrote the following (*op. cit.*, p. 84):

> The appeals described in the following fallacies often serve to take advantage of the ignorance of the audience rather than overcome it. They play on prejudices and misconceptions instead of meeting them squarely. And one must very often suspect that, unlike some fallacies which are the result of ignorance or carelessness, these appeals are dishonest in intent.

That Eisenberg's appeal to authority probably is dishonest in intent is indicated by his brazen falsehoods in *Witness to the Holocaust*, some of which I pointed out in my review of that book, as well as in *The Lost Generation*.

One rather brazen falsehood in this latter book is on page 127, where he says, "When the Red Army freed Auschwitz, fewer than 450 Jews were among the survivors; not a child was left alive." This really involves two falsehoods. First there is Eisenberg's statement that "fewer than 450 Jews were among the survivors" when the Red Army captured Auschwitz. While it may be true that there were only 450 Jewish survivors of Auschwitz still *in*

Auschwitz when the Red Army arrived (and I don't know if that figure is accurate). Eisenberg's statement conveniently ignores the fact that there were thousands of Jewish Auschwitz survivors *who were no longer at Auschwitz* by the time the Red Army reached there in late January, 1945. Tens of thousands of Auschwitz inmates, at least, including many Jews, were transferred to other camps during 1943 and 1944. For example, Dr. Ada Bimko, a.k.a. Hadassah Bimko-Rosensaft, was transferred from Auschwitz to Belsen in November, 1944. (Henry A. Zeiger, ed., *The Case Against Adolf Eichmann*, Signet, 1960, p. 180.) Furthermore, tens of thousands more Auschwitz prisoners were marched westward out of Auschwitz shortly before the arrival of the Red Army. Martin Gilbert says, "At the end of the first week of January [1945], as the Red Army drew nearer to Auschwitz, the Gestapo began to organize the evacuation of more than 65,000 Jewish prisoners." (*Auschwitz and the Allies*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1981, p. 334.) Gilbert probably exaggerated the number of Jewish prisoners evacuated by assuming that all Auschwitz inmates were Jewish. Jozef Garlinski wrote, "At the final evening roll-call, on January 17th [1945], the whole complex, comprising the central camp, Birkenau and Monowice with a number of sub-camps, contained 48,340 men and 18,672 women." (*Fighting Auschwitz*, pp. 341-342.) That adds up to 67,012 prisoners, about the same number Gilbert gave just for Jewish prisoners. But elsewhere in his book (p. 236), Garlinski said that Poles comprised the largest nationality within the camp population, Jews the second largest. In any case, there were thousands of Jews, perhaps ten thousand or more, among those evacuated from Auschwitz shortly before the Red Army arrived. So Eisenberg's reference to a mere 450 Jewish survivors is grossly misleading.

And his other statement, that "not a child was left alive" when the Red Army reached Auschwitz, is just plain false. On page 249 of Gerhard Schoenberner's *The Yellow Star* (Bantam, 1973), there is a photo of some children, prisoners of Auschwitz, who "lived to be liberated by the Red Army." What makes this falsehood particularly brazen is that one of Eisenberg's own witnesses in *The Lost Generation* gives contradictory testimony. On page 205, describing events between the evacuation of Auschwitz by the Germans and the arrival of the Red Army, Leon Shlofsky says, "We decided to proceed to Birkenau to save the women and children who were still living." As I said in my review of *Witness to the Holocaust*, Azriel Eisenberg is not a leading Jewish scholar, as it says on the dust jacket of that book. Rather, he is a *mis*leading Jewish scholar.

Getting back to the West German Federal Supreme Court's decision, the court said, "Whoever tries to deny the truth of past events, denies to every Jew the respect to which he is entitled." But is it only Jews who are entitled to respect or to whom such respect is denied by attempts to deny the truth of past events? For example, if someone accuses Germans of committing atrocities which never took place, are they not attempting to deny the truth of past events and thereby denying Germans the respect to which they are entitled? Consider this whopper from "Nazi-hunter" Tuvia Friedman: "We drove for a while in silence, until we approached Dachau. Silently, Yoske and I looked at the extermination camp where millions of innocent people had been executed." (*The Hunter*, Macfadden, 1961, p. 113.) *Millions* of people were executed at Dachau? No, not even according to former Dachau inmate Nerin E. Gun, whose estimate of the number of deaths at Dachau was not a conservative one. Gun has written, ". . . it is with some skepticism that I report here certain statistics compiled after the liberation. First, there are those of Domgala, who figured that 206,204 persons went through Dachau. I would put the figure closer to 450,000." (*The Day of the Americans*, Fleet, 1966, p. 128.) Gun also wrote (pp. 128-129),

> It is impossible to ascertain the number of deaths in the camp from 1933 to 1940. It was certainly more than 15,000. From 1940 to liberation, a former camp inmate, Domgala, a responsible witness, accounts for 27,830 deaths, but that figure must be a minimum. In fact, more than 100,000 died at Dachau, or approximately one out of four inmates.

When Tuvia Friedman said that millions of people were executed at Dachau, was he not attempting to deny the truth of past events? And was he not thereby denying to Germans the respect to which they are entitled? Or are Germans less entitled to respect than Jews, less entitled to have the truth told about them?

The court said, "Whoever tries to deny the truth of past events, denies to every Jew the respect to which he is entitled." But what exactly *is* the truth of past events? Where may one find the truth of past events inscribed in clear, consistent, unquestionable and undeniable form?

Is it true, for example, that Jews were gassed *en masse* with Zyklon B at Auschwitz-Birkenau? Apart from a few documents, whose meaning is at best debatable, the evidence for such mass gassings consists entirely of testimony, the most important of which being the "eyewitness" testimony.* The "eyewitness," however, contradict each other on various points, and some of them contradict themselves. More importantly, the stories of these "eyewitnesses" involve what appear to be various physical impossibilities. To give just one example, "eyewitnesses" have claimed that Zyklon B was capable of killing instantaneously, or within a few minutes, or in five minutes, or within three or fifteen minutes. But, citing document NI-9912, Friedrich Berg has written, ". . . the time required for the Zyklon to take effect would range from 6 to 32 hours depending upon the type of vermin and temperature. Since it is well known that cyanide kills very quickly given a sufficient concentration of the gas, the 6 to 32 hour period must have been essentially the period needed to produce a sufficient concentration by evaporation out of the Zyklon B granules." (See the Publisher's Footnote on page 4 of Robert Faurisson's, *The "Problem of the 'Gas Chambers'" or "The Rumor of Auschwitz,"* Revisionist Press, Rochelle Park, New Jersey, 1979. For more on the question of the physical possibility of the alleged Zyklon B gassings, see Robert Faurisson's two contributions to *The Journal of Historical Review,* Volume Two, Number Four.)

---

*There is a room (in the crematorium of Auschwitz I) that allegedly was used as a gas chamber before being converted into an air-raid shelter sometime in 1944. But this room constitutes evidence of the alleged Zyklon B gassings only in conjunction with the testimony that it was used for such gassings.

Would the court insist that the "eyewitness" testimonies about mass gassings with Zyklon B *must* be true whether or not they involve physical impossibilities? If so, why? After all, a general principle that "eyewitness" testimony must be true would suffice to establish the reality, not only of mass gassings with Zyklon B, but also of the ritual murder of Christian children by Jews seeking blood for Passover matzohs, witchcraft and everything that involved, werewolves and vampires, the golden tablets from which Joseph Smith translated *The Book of Mormon,* forced conversions in Catholic nunneries, the angel of Mons, the miracle of the sun at Fatima, and "Mad Gasser" of Mattoon, Illinois, the post-WWII survival of Adolf Hitler, flying saucers and extraterrestial visitations of Earth, Bigfoot, etc. If, for example, one denies that witches ever flew through the air to sabbats where the Devil appeared as a being, half man and half goat, and where the flesh of babies was eaten, etc., is one denying the truth of the past and thereby denying to victims of witchcraft the respect to which they are entitled?

In any case, if Robert Faurisson and the revisionists are right, then the Zyklon B gassings, as described by "eyewitnesses," were physically impossible. And if that is the case, then it seems we are again confronted with a miracle, indeed, with a whole series of miracles.

On second thought, perhaps we are confronted, not with a series of miracles, but rather with a series of lies by "eyewitnesses." As Thomas Paine said, echoing the argument of David Hume,

> If . . . we see an account given of such a miracle by the person who said he saw it, it raises a question in the mind very easily decided, which is, is it more probable that nature should go out of her course, or that a man should tell a lie? We have never seen, in our time, nature go out of her course; but we have good reason to believe that millions of lies have been told in the same time; it is, therefore, at least millions to one, that the reporter of a miracle tells a lie. (Quoted by George H. Smith in *Atheism: The Case Against God*, Nash, 1974, p. 218.)

By the same token, it is at least millions to one that the "eyewitness" reporter of physically impossible Zyklon B gassings has told a lie. (And the same goes for "eyewitness" reporters of *any* kind of physically impossible "Holocaust" happenings.) According to Robert Conquest, there is a Russian folk saying: "He lies like an eyewitness." Of course, not all eyewitnesses are liars, although even most honest eyewitnesses, for the reasons discussed earlier, give testimony that is to some extent false. But some eyewitnesses *are* liars. And some liars pretend to be eyewitnesses of places they've never been and things they've never seen (for example, Martin Gray).

Azriel Eisenberg's brandishing of the West German Federal Supreme Court's dictum ("Whoever tries to deny the truth of past events, denies to every Jew the respect to which he is entitled.") is both hypocritical and disingenuous. Hypocritical because Eisenberg's regard for the truth of past events is minimal, if not nonexistent. This is demonstrated both by his own falsehoods, in this book and his previous one, and by his selection of "eyewitness" accounts of "the Holocaust" containing palpable falsehoods, the "eyewitness" account of Shaye Gertner and the hearsay testimony of Mr. Lieberman being the most blatant examples.

Eisenberg's invoking of the court's dictum is disingenuous because it is not merely respect that Eisenberg wants for himself and his "eyewitnesses": it is reverence that he wants. As he said of his earlier collection of "eyewitness" accounts of "the Holocaust," ". . . it must be studied with awe and reverence." (*Witness to the Holocaust*, pp. 4-5.)

Ambrose Bierce wittily defined "reverence" as, "The spiritual attitude of a man to a god and a dog to a man." But Eisenberg and his "eyewitnesses" are not gods, nor am I a dog, although I am a Gentile. They are merely human beings, as I am. So I see no reason to revere Eisenberg and his "eyewitnesses," no reason to put them on a pedestal, above skepticism, above criticism. As far as I am concerned, the fact that some or all of Eisenberg's witnesses suffered at the hands of the Nazis does not give them a license to lie.

As Rabbi Richard E. Singer, of the Lakeside Congregation of Highland Park, Illinois, has said (quoted by Alfred M. Lilienthal in *The Zionist Connection*, Dodd, Mead, 1978, p. 401),

> Jews have suffered, and Christians have suffered. Mankind has suffered. There is no group with a monopoly on suffering, and no human beings which have experienced hate and hostility more than any other. I must say, however, that it is my impression that Jewish history has been taught with a whine and a whimper rather than with a straight-forward acknowledgement that man practices his inhumanity on his fellow human beings . . . Out of this peculiar emphasis on suffering there has developed a new attitude of vicarious suffering—a feeling among numbers of Jews today that because other Jews have suffered and died they, the living, are somehow entitled to special consideration.

If only Azriel Eisenberg would take Rabbi Singer's well-chosen words to heart, then *The Last Generation* would be Eisenberg's last compilation of "stories of suffering and death." If only. If only.

Behind the Balfour Declaration, Notes, continued from page 450.

195. Within three weeks of the presentation of the preceeding lecture at the IHR conference 241 U.S. Marines and 58 French servicemen were killed in Beirut on 23 October 1983.

196. *Israel's Sacred Terrorism*, by Livia Rokach. Belmont, 1980: Assoc. of Arab-Amer. Grads. Contains the memoirs of Moshe Sharett 1953-57, Israel's first Foreign Minister and second Prime Minister.

197. "A Strategy for Israel in the Nineteen Eighties," by Oded Yinon, a former officer in the Israeli Foreign Ministry. In *Kivunim* (Directions), the Hebrew-language journal of the Department of Information of the World Zionist Organization, February 1982. "The dissolution of Syria and Iraq . . . into ethnically or religious unique areas such as in Lebanon, is Israel's primary target on the eastern front in the long run, while the dissolution of the military power of those states serves as the short term target," the presentation reads in part.

Dr. John's lecture, in a somewhat condensed form, is available on cassette tape from the IHR for $8.95.

Rauschning's Phony 'Conversations With Hitler'—An Update

One of the most widely quoted sources of information about Hitler's personality and secret intentions is the supposed memoir of Hermann Rauschning, the National Socialist President of the Danzig Senate in 1933–1934 who was ousted from the Hitler movement a short time later and then made a new life for himself as a professional anti-Nazi.

In the book known in German as *Conversations with Hitler* (*Gespraeche mit Hitler*) and first published in the U.S. in 1940 as *The Voice of Destruction*, Rauschning presents page after page of what are purported to be Hitler's most intimate views and plans for the future, allegedly based on dozens of private conversations between 1932 and 1934. After the war the memoir was introduced as Allied prosecution exhibit USSR-378 at the main Nuremberg "war crimes" trial.

Among the damning quotations attributed to Hitler by Rauschning are these memorable statements:

> We must be brutal. We must regain a clear conscience about brutality. Only then can we drive out the tenderness from our people. . . . Do I propose to exterminate entire nationalities? Yes, it will add up to that. . . . I naturally have the right to destroy millions of men of inferior races who increase like vermin. . . . Yes, we are barbarians. We want to be barbarians. It is an honorable title.

Hitler is also supposed to have confided to Rauschning, an almost unknown provincial official, fantastic plans for a German world empire that would include Africa, South America, Mexico and, eventually, the United States.

Many prestigious historians, including Leon Poliakov, Gerhard Weinberg, Alan Bullock, Joachim Fest, Nora Levin and Robert Payne, used choice quotations from Rauschning's memoir in their works of history. Poliakov, one of the most prominent Holocaust writers, specifically praised Rauschning for his "exceptional accuracy" while Levin, another widely-read Holocaust historian, called him "one of the most penetrating analysts of the Nazi period."

But not everyone has been so credulous. Swiss historian Wolfgang Haenel spent five years diligently investigating the memoir before announcing his findings in 1983 at a revisionist history conference in West Germany. The renowned *Conversations with Hitler*, he declared, are a total fraud. The book has no value "except as a document of Allied war propaganda."

Haenel was able to conclusively establish that Rauschning's claim to have met with Hitler "more than a hundred times" is a lie. The two actually met only four times, and never alone. The words attributed to Hitler, he showed, were simply invented or lifted from many different sources, including writings by Ernst Juenger and Friedrich Nietzsche. An account of Hitler hearing voices, waking at night with convulsive shrieks and pointing in terror at an empty corner while shouting "There, there, in the corner!" was taken from a short story by French writer Guy de Maupassant.

The phony memoir was designed to incite public opinion in democratic countries, especially in the United States, in favor of war against Germany. The project was the brainchild of the Hungarian-born journalist Emery Reves, who ran an influential anti-German press and propaganda agency in Paris during the 1930s. Haenel has also found evidence that a prominent British journalist named Henry Wickham-Steele helped to produce the memoir. Wickham-Steele was a right-hand man of Sir Robert Vansittart, perhaps the most vehemently anti-German figure in Britain.

A report about Haenel's sensational findings appeared in the Fall 1983 issue of *The Journal of Historical Review*. More recently, West Germany's most influential weekly periodicals, *Die Zeit* and *Der Spiegel* (7 September 1985), have run lengthy articles about the historical hoax. *Der Spiegel* concluded that Rauschning's *Conversations with Hitler* "are a falsification, an historical distortion from the first to the last page . . . Haenel not only proves the falsification, he also shows how the impressive surrogate was quickly compiled and which ingredients were mixed together."

There are some valuable lessons to be learned from the story of this sordid hoax, which took more than 40 years to finally unmask: It shows that even the most brazen historical fraud can have a tremendous impact if it serves important interests, that it's much easier to invent a great historical lie than to expose one and, finally, that everyone should be extremely wary of even the most "authoritative" portrayals of the emotionally-charged Hitler era.

A footnote: Readers interested in an authentic record of Hitler's personality and private views should look into the fascinating and wide-ranging memoir of Otto Wagener, published in August 1985 by Yale University Press under the title *Hitler: Memoirs of a Confidant*. Wagener was the first Chief of Staff of the SA ("stormtroopers") and Director of the Economic-Political Department of the National Socialist Party. He spent hundreds of hours with Hitler between 1929 and 1932, many of them alone.

* * * * * * *

Stalin Prepared for Summer 1941 Attack

Viktor Suvorov is a former member of the Soviet General Staff who now lives in the West. He is the author of three authoritative works on the Soviet armed forces. Writing in the June 1985 issue of the *Journal of the Royal United Services Institute for Defence Studies,* Suvorov assembles impressive evidence to show that Stalin was preparing to attack Germany in 1941. The respected British journal introduced this startling article by noting that "historians who have hitherto uncritically accepted the thesis that Stalin was the victim of unprovoked aggression in the summer of 1941 may have to revise, or at least modify, their views."

Suvorov writes that on 13 June 1941 Stalin secretly began "the biggest troop movement in the history of civilization," transferring enormous military forces to the Soviet-German frontier.The Soviet troops were deployed there not for defense, but in preparation for a surprise invasion.

"It seems certain," writes Suvorov, "that the Soviet concentration on the frontier was due to be completed by 10 July. Thus, the German blow which fell just 19 days earlier found the Red Army in the most unfavorable situation—in railway waggons."

Citing information compiled mostly from official Soviet sources, Suvorov concludes that "the only credible military intention which Stalin could have had was to begin the war himself in the summer of 1941."

Suvorov's essay, which is based on a still uncompleted Ph.D. thesis, strengthens the view of David Irving, Erich Helmdach and other revisionist historians that the attack by Germany and her Axis partners against the USSR on 22 June 1941 was a preventive measure necessitated by a forthcoming Soviet onslaught against Europe.

* * * * * * *

Churchill Wanted to "Drench" Germany With Poison Gas

In a secret wartime memorandum recently made public, Winston Churchill told his advisers that he wanted to "drench" Germany with poison gas. Churchill's July 1944 memo to his chief of staff Gen. Hastings Ismay was reproduced in the August-September 1985 issue of *American Heritage* magazine.

"I want you to think very seriously over this question of poison gas," the four-page note began. Britain's wartime leader continued: "It is absurd to consider morality on this topic when everybody used it [gas] in the last war without a word of complaint from the moralists or the Church. On the other hand, in the last war the bombing of open cities was regarded as forbidden. Now everybody does it as a matter of course. It is simply a question of fashion changing as she does between long and short skirts for women."

Churchill's directive bluntly stated: "I want a cold-blooded calculation made as to how it would pay to use poison gas . . . One really must not be bound within silly conventions of the mind whether they be those that ruled in the last war or those in reverse which rule in this." Specifically he proposed: "We could drench the cities of the Ruhr and many other cities in Germany in such a way that most of the population would be requiring constant medical attention. . . . It may be several weeks or even months before I shall ask you to drench Germany with poison gas, and if we do it, let us do it one hundred per cent. In the meantime, I want the matter studied in cold blood by sensible people and not by the particular set of psalm-singing uniformed defeatists which one runs across now here now there."

Churchill's proposal, which would have meant violating the 1925 Geneva Protocol outlawing the use of poison gas, was never adopted. His military advisers argued that gas warfare would divert Allied war planes from the more effective strategy of bombing Germany's industries and cities. Gas attacks would not be decisive, they feared, and Germany would very probably retaliate with devastating effect against Britain. Churchill complained to an associate that he was "not at all convinced by this negative report," but he reluctantly gave in. "Clearly I cannot make head against the parsons and the warriors at the same time," he complained in private.

The *American Heritage* article, written by Stanford University history professor Barton J. Bernstein, also reported that top American military officials urged the U.S. to begin gas warfare against Japan. Maj. Gen. William N. Porter, chief of the Chemical Warfare Service, pleaded in mid-December 1943 with U.S. Army superiors to initiate gas warfare against the Japanese, and on several occasions in 1945 Gen. George C. Marshall, U.S. Army chief of staff, urged using gas in the Pacific. There was some popular support for this view. The New York *Daily News* declared "We Should Gas Japan," and Washington *Times-Herald* agreed, explaining "You Can Cook 'Em Better with Gas." But this was a minority view. About 75 percent of Americans reportedly opposed initiating gas warfare. After the war Gen. Marshall said that the main reason that gas wasn't used was opposition from the British, who feared that a desperate Germany might then use it in Europe.

The United States produced about 135,000 tons of chemical warfare agents during the war, while Germany turned out about 70,000 tons, Britain about 40,000 and Japan only 7,500 tons. Although the Allies had larger stockpiles of traditional chemical agents, Germany developed far more advanced and lethal nerve gasses, most notably the devastating agents Tabun, Sarin and Soman. They were never used.

After the war a British Army chemical warfare expert concluded that Germany could have delayed the June 1944 Allied cross-Channel invasion by six months if it had gas. "Such a delay," he noted, "could have given the Germans sufficient time to complete their new V-weapons, which would have made the Allies' task all the harder and England's long range bombardment considerably worse." Even in March and April 1945, when German military resistance was rapidly collapsing, Germany kept to its pledge not to use gas. Hitler reportedly refused to consider using poison gas in part because of his recollection of the horror of his own gassing during the First World War, which temporarily blinded him.

—Mark Weber

* * * * * * *

Millions Go Into New Museums

National Holocaust Museum to Cost $100 Million

The campaign for the "U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum" in Washington, D.C., "has moved into high gear," says national director David Weinstein. More than $13 million in gifts and pledges for the museum center have already been received, he reports, and the campaign is receiving "support from all sectors of American life, which should enable construction of the museum to begin in the fall."

The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, an independent federal government agency, was mandated by Congress to build the national museum, which will be the only one in the world outside of Israel. President Ronald Reagan is honorary chairman of the museum's fund-raising campaign.

The Council has set the Spring of 1989 as the target date for completion of the museum, which will be built near the Mall and the Washington Monument. Churches, schools, labor unions and corporations are scheduled to participate in the national fund-raising drive for the museum center, which will be supported with a massive nationwide Holocaust media barrage. The campaign will aim to collect $100 million, including an estimated $30 million for construction costs, $45 million for equipment, exhibits, computer systems, films and books, and $25 million for maintenance and operating costs.

The 275,000-square-foot museum center building will include a 10,000 square foot "Hall of Remembrance," as well as a library, an archives, an auditorium and classrooms. Some 80,000 square feet of space will be reserved for both permanent and changing exhibitions. The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council expects the museum to serve regional and local Holocaust centers across the country.

Although it was mandated by the U.S. Congress and will be built with funds from the American public, the museum is supposed to memorialize non-Americans who died on another continent more than forty years ago. There will be no comparable memorial center for the millions of non-Jewish victims of Soviet Communism, the aboriginal Indians eliminated in the expansion of the United States, or even for the 290,000 Americans who died during the Second World War.

Thoughtful people in our country and around the world will realize, even if millions of credulous Americans do not, that this museum, like the entire Holocaust campaign, is a hypocritical and mercenary venture meant primarily to generate special sympathy and support for Zionist Jewish objectives.

The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum will be, above all, a monument to the historically unparalleled power and influence of a small but determined minority group, and a permanent reminder to all Americans of the craven lack of integrity and principle of those who authorized it. As the massive fund-raising and media campaign for the museum gets underway, the work of the IHR and historical revisionism will become all the more important.

—Mark Weber

* * * * * * *

Los Angeles "Museum of Tolerance" to Cost $30 Million

On 30 July of this year, California's Governor, George "Duke" Deukmejian, signed into law SB 337. This bill, introduced by Democratic State Senator David Roberti, of Hollywood, authorizes a grant of $5 million to the Simon Wiesenthal Center of Los Angeles for its "Museum of Tolerance" expansion program.

The bill was signed despite the public opposition of the *Los*

Angeles Times, and of some major Jewish organizations, including the so-called Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Congress.

And it was signed despite Deukmejian's vetoing of similar measures in the past. "Earlier this year Deukmejian votoed more than $4 million for private museums in the proposed budget sent to him by the legislature. In his veto message, he said he was 'concerned about the seeming proliferation of appropriations related to museums and exhibitions.' "

Although Deukmejian signed SB 337 without comment or explanation, it appears that the governor, who is of Armenian descent, was bought off by the promise of Wiesenthal Center officials that the Museum of Tolerance will include a token exhibit about the so-called Armenian Genocide of 1915, a topic dear to his heart.

Marshall Phillips, legislative chair of the West Hollywood Democratic Club, complains that Wiesenthal Center officials will not promise to give recognition to homosexuals as victims of Hitlerian intolerance. Phillips claims that "tens of thousands of homosexual men were also systematically exterminated or brutally worked to death in enterprises attached to various concentration camps." (For the sake of convenience, I suggest that henceforward we all refer to the alleged Nazi extermination of homosexuals as "the Homocaust.") Phillips says he queried Senator Roberti's office about the exclusion of homosexuals from the "Museum of Tolerance" and was told, "To include others would water down the whole event."

The criticism that SB 337 violates the First Amendment's requirement of church-state separation is still being made as well. Ron Nelson, an atheist activist, writes, "I wonder if there are any consistent atheist, nationalist, humanist or 'freedom from religious' (sic) organizations that still believe in the First Amendment. . . .

I wonder if any of these organizations or the American Civil Liberties Union will have the courage of their convictions to challenge this blatant violation of the separation of state and church in court."

The week before Deukmejian signed SB 337, one of the opponents, American Jewish Congress vice president Doug Mirell, said his group and others were considering suing the state over the issue if necessary. However, no one has actually taken any such action as yet.

If anyone does challenge the constitutionality of SB 337 in court, they should be sure to read the special report on the Wiesenthal Center by Gary Rosenblatt, published last year in *The Baltimore Jewish Times*.

Wiesenthal Center officials have lately been attempting to pass their Holocaust museum off as a non-sectarian, humanitarian institution. Thus, they incorporated the Center, until recently a part of Yeshiva University, as a separate nonprofit organization. But Rosenblatt's interview with Wiesenthal Center Director Rabbi Marvin Hier apparently conducted before Hier got the bright idea of soaking California's taxpayers, makes it perfectly clear that the Wiesenthal Center is a specifically Jewish institution, dedicated to specifically Jewish ends.

Consider these revealing excerpts from Rosenblatt's article:

> [Hier] says he felt from the beginning that the ideal site for a Holocaust museum would be a yeshiva because it would offer living proof that Judaism had survived Hitler. "What is the ultimate memorial to the six million? That Torah lives on, that the Jewish people live on," says the rabbi. "Our memorial is against assimilation, it stands for the future destiny of the Jewish people. It's not a cold memorial of bricks and mortar but a place where students carry out God's command to be vigilant against Amalek (the Biblical personification of Israel's enemies). That's the lesson of the Holocaust."

Responding to the argument that he conceived the Holocaust Center as a means of attracting wide-scale support for his yeshiva he says: "You have to bring a person to his Jewish feelings through what he cares about. The Holocaust is a tragedy most Jews can relate to, while keeping kosher or observing Shabbos is alien to so many. . . ." (Rosenblatt, "The Simon Wiesenthal Center: State-of-the-art Activism or Hollywood Hype?" *Baltimore Jewish Times*, 14 September 1984, p. 73.)

> . . . We see ourselves as an Orthodox institution not happy with the image that Orthodox institutions must be limited to narrow religious issues. We're not like that. We operate on every front. We will speak up whenever and wherever Jews are put on the defensive. Our goal is to work for *Am Yisrael* (the people of Israel) and be involved in all issues affecting Jews. . . ." (Rosenblatt, *op. cit.*, p.. 74.)

There you have it, right from the rabbi's big mouth: the Wiesenthal Center is an Orthodox Jewish institution whose goal is to work for "the people of Israel" and to be involved in all issues affecting Jews.

It is this Orthodox Jewish—and Zionist—outfit that California's taxpayers will be forced to subsidize unless somebody goes to court and gets SB 337 overturned. So what are all the First Amendment Fundamentalists waiting for? A sign from God?

—L.A. Rollins

(As it happens, the American Civil Liberties Union has filed suit in Los Angeles Superior Court to stop the state from providing the $5 million for the proposed museum of tolerance. The suit contends that construction of this museum on the campus of Yeshiva University in Los Angeles would be in violation of the California Constitution's mandate for separation of church and state. It maintains what is clear to all honest citizens, that Yeshiva University is a private religious educational institution.

Rabbi Marvin Hier, director of the Simon Wiesenthal Center and dean of Yeshiva University as well, each of which are housed in the same buildings, is prepared to "vigorously defend" the constitutionality of the grant. "Preventing the spread of hatred and bigotry is the responsibility of all and has nothing to do with the issue of church and state," Hier said.

The very concept of a museum of "tolerance" is a vulgarity, and if Rabbi Hier keeps his hand in it, a significant segment of the Jewish community will probably find it offensive as well. The concept implies that tolerance is not to be found in the daily lives of our citizenry, in our communities, our literature and other arts, and therefore we don't know what it is. Rabbi Hier thinks it is necessary to go to a Jewish museum to discover the nature of tolerance.

Maybe revisionists should welcome the erection of such a pleasure palace of neuroticism as it will reveal to the many how much deception and fraud the Holocausters are trading in, information which now is restricted to the minority who read revisionist literature.)

* * * * * * *

California Subsidizes Japanese-American Museum

In a 180-degree turnaround, Gov. George Deukmejian has signed a bill authorizing a $750,000 grant for a Japanese-American history museum planned for an historic Buddhist temple in the Little Tokyo section of Los Angeles. Only a few months ago, Deukmejian had cut the $750,000 grant from the state budget.

The bill, authored by State Senator Art Torres (D-South Pasadena), will give the money to Los Angeles if the City raises at least $1 million in matching funds. The Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency is expected to provide the necessary $1 million in "redevelopment funds."

"There needs to be a constant reminder of the sometimes illogical actions of government," said Torres, alluding to the "internment" of thousands of Japanese-Americans during World War II.

According to Bruce Kaji, president of the Japanese-American National Museum Foundation, the museum will show "the experiences of a minority group that has gone through normal immigration and adjustments . . . but also suffered civil injustices during World War II." Kaji has said, "It will also serve as a conscience of America, so such things do not happen again."

The museum will include exhibits of Japanese-Americans' contributions to agriculture, horticulture, fishing, mining and railroad construction, according to Kaji.

—L.A. Rollins

* * * * * * *

Chicago Tribune History

Perhaps the most telling aspect of World War Two historical orthodoxy is its one-dimensional view of war criminals; by current definition these are the losers of a war. The winners decide the degree of the losers' culpability and the depth of their depravity.

Apart from this victor's morality play is the reality of the difficult-to-envision scope of the war criminality of such vaunted heroes of democracy as Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, as well as those who, as "good Americans" carried out their policies of deliberate and needless mass murder.

On an equivalent level of incomprehension rests the knowledge that incontrovertible proof of the war crimes of the Allied leadership had no more impact on their legend of benevolence than revelations about the war crimes of Zionism and the duplicity its intellectual apologists have had on foreign policy or public opinion today.

Some proof of the former was offered by *Chicago Tribune* reporter Walter Trohan. Due to wartime censorship, he was forced to withhold for seven months the biggest story of America's war in the Pacific. It was finally published on the Sunday following VJ-Day, August 19, 1945, on the front pages of both the *Tribune* and the Washington *Times-Herald.*

Trohan's article revealed that two days prior to Roosevelt's departure for Yalta, the president received a crucial, forty page memorandum from General Douglas MacArthur outlining five separate surrender overtures from highly placed Japanese officials offering surrender terms which were virtually identical to the ones eventually dictated by the Allies to the Japanese in August.

The MacArthur communication was leaked to Trohan in early 1945 by Admiral William D. Leahy, FDR's chief of staff, who feared it would be classified as top secret for decades or even destroyed. The authenticity of Trohan's article (which elicited no editorial notice or re-publication in any other major U.S. newspaper), was never challenged by the White House. Former President Herbert Hoover personally queried General MacArthur on the *Tribune*'s story and the general acknowledged its accuracy in every detail.

According to Harry Elmer Barnes, Truman was aware of the January surrender offer by the Japanese and privately confessed that both atomic warfare as well as further conventional military operations were unnecessary for concluding the war in the Pacific.

The significance of General MacArthur's statement to Roosevelt is monumental. Trohan's article shows that the war in the Pacific could have been over by the early Spring and that Roosevelt had sent thousands of American boys to needless deaths at Iwo Jima and Okinawa as Truman would later do to hundreds of thousands of civilians at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The measure of FDR can be found in the realization that he dismissed MacArthur's report after only a "casual reading" and described the general as a "poor politician." Indeed, in the politics of mass murder MacArthur was a non-contender. The skilled players, FDR, Truman and Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson tried out their new military "toy," as Barnes described the A-bomb, without a scintilla of justification.

—Michael A. Hoffman II

Chicago Tribune, August 19, 1945

JAPS ASKED PEACE IN JAN. ENVOYS ON WAY—TOKYO

Roosevelt Ignored M'Arthur Report On Nip Proposals

By Walter Trohan

Release of all censorship restrictions in the United States makes it possible to report that the first Japanese peace bid was relayed to the White House seven months ago.

Two days before the late President Roosevelt left the last week in January for the Yalta conference with Prime Minister Churchill and Marshal Stalin, he received a Japanese offer identical with the terms subsequently concluded by his successor, Harry S. Truman.

MacArthur Relayed Message to F.D.

The Jap offer, based on five separate overtures, was relayed to the White House by Gen. MacArthur in a 40-page communication. The American commander, who had just returned triumphantly to Bataan, urged negotiations on the basis of the Jap overtures.

The offer, as relayed by MacArthur, contemplated abject surrender of everything but the person of the Emperor. The suggestion was advanced from the Japanese quarters making the offer that the Emperor become a puppet in the hands of American forces.

Two of the five Jap overtures were made through American channels and three through British channels. All came from responsible Japanese, acting for Emperor Hirohito.

General's Communication Dismissed

President Roosevelt dismissed the general's communication, which was studded with solemn references to the deity, after a casual reading with the remark, "MacArthur is our greatest general and our poorest politician."

The MacArthur report was not even taken to Yalta. However, it was carefully preserved in the files of the high command and subsequently became the basis of the Truman-Attlee Potsdam declaration calling for surrender of Japan.

This Jap peace bid was known to the Chicago *Tribune* and the Washington *Times-Herald* shortly after the MacArthur communication reached here. It was not published under the papers' established policy of complete co-operation with the voluntary censorship code.

Must Explain Delay

Now that peace has been concluded on the basis of the terms MacArthur reported, high administration officials prepared to meet expected congressional demands for explanation of the delay. It was considered certain that from various quarters of Congress charges would be hurled that the delay cost thousands of American lives and casualties, particularly in such costly offensives as Iwo Jima and Okinawa.

It was explained in high official circles that the bid relayed by MacArthur did not constitute an official offer in the same sense as the final offer which was presented through Japanese diplomatic channels at Bern and Stockholm last week for relay to the four major Allied powers.

No negotiations were begun on the basis of the bid, it was said, because it was feared that if any were undertaken the Jap war lords, who were presumed to be ignorant of the feelers, would visit swift punishment on those making the offer.

It was held possible that the war lords might even assassinate the Emperor and announce the son of heaven had fled the earth in a fury of indignation over the peace bid.

Defeat Seen Inevitable

Officials said it was felt by Mr. Roosevelt that the Japs were not ripe for peace, except for a small group, who were powerless to cope with the war lords, and that peace could not come until the Japs had suffered more.

The Jap overtures were made on acknowledgment that defeat was inevitable and Japan had to choose the best way out of an unhappy dilemma—domination of Asia by Russia or by the United States. The unofficial Jap peace brokers said the latter would be preferable by far.

Jap proposals to Gen. MacArthur contemplated:

> 1. Full surrender of all Jap forces on sea, in the air, at home, on island possessions and in occupied countries.
> 2. Surrender of all arms and munitions.
> 3. Occupation of the Jap homeland and island possessions by Allied troops under American direction.

Would Give Up Territory

> 4. Jap relinquishment from Manchuria, Korea and Formosa as well as all territory seized during the war.
> 5. Regulation of Jap industry to halt present and future production of implements of war.
> 6. Turning over of any Japanese the United States might designate as war criminals.
> 7. Immediate release of all prisoners of war and internees in Japan proper and areas under Japanese control.

After the fall of Germany, the policy of unconditional surrender drew critical fire. In the Senate Senator White (R.) of Maine and Capehart (R.) of Indiana took the lead in demanding that precise terms be given Japan and in asking whether peace feelers had not been received from the Nipponese.

Terms Drafted in July

In July the *Tribune* reported that a set of terms were being drafted for President Truman to take to Potsdam. Capehart hailed the reported terms on the floor of the Senate as a great contribution to universal peace.

These terms, which were embodied in the Potsdam declaration, did not mention the disposition of the Emperor. Otherwise they were almost identical with the proposals contained in the MacArthur memorandum.

Just before the Japanese surrender the Russian foreign commissar disclosed that the Japs had made peace overtures through Moscow asking that the Soviets mediate the war. These overtures were made in the middle of June through the Russian foreign office and also through a personal letter from Hirohito to Stalin. Both overtures were reported to the United States and Britain.

For further reading:

Barnes, Harry Elmer, "Hiroshima: Assault on a Beaten Foe," *National Review*, May 10, 1958, pp. 441-443.
Current, Richard N., *Secretary Stimson*, Rutgers University Press, 1954.
Trohan, Walter, *Political Animals.*
Zacharias, Ellis M., *Secret Missions.*

About the Contributors

ROBERT JOHN is a foreign affairs analyst. Dr. John studied law at The Middle Temple, Inns of Court in London, with a special interest in Constitutional Law and the history of law. He is a lecturer and writer on diplomatic history and international affairs and a radio and TV broadcaster in the United States, Canada, Africa and on the BBC Overseas Service.

MICHIKO HASEGAWA was born in 1945 and did postgraduate work in philosophy at the University of Tokyo. She is now an associate professor at Saitama University, Japan.

MICHAEL A. HOFFMAN II is the author of *The Great Holocaust Trial*, recently published by the IHR.

L.A. ROLLINS is a Contributing Editor of the *IHR Newsletter*. He has also written for other publications, including *Reason*, *New Libertarian*, *Critique*, *The Spotlight*, and is a regular contributor to *The JHR*. He is the author of *The Myth of Natural Rights*.

MARK WEBER was born and raised in Oregon and received his higher education at Portland State University (BA, History, 1976), the University of Illinois, the University of Munich, and Indiana University (MA, Central European History, 1977). Based in Washington, D.C., Mr. Weber works as a freelance researcher, author and German translator. He is a frequent contributor to *The JHR*, and presented papers to the 1980 and 1982 International Revisionist conferences. He is currently at work on a major revisionist study of the "Final Solution."

INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW PRESENTS THE

SEVENTH INTERNATIONAL REVISIONIST CONFERENCE

Special Awards and
revisionist video
presentations

15-17 February 1986
(Presidents' Day weekend)

Meet and hear Defense
attorney Doug Christie
(Zundel and Keegstra trials)

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

A stimulating variety of iconoclastic papers will be presented live by the men on the forefront of historical revisionism.

- Dr. Georg Franz-Willing on the breakthroughs and increasing state suppression of World War II revisionism in West Germany.
- Ivor Benson on the historical origins and development of the ongoing campaign to internationalize southern Africa.
- Dr. Ivo Omrcanin on the role of British intelligence in the creation of the communist dictator Marshall Josip Broz Tito.
- Dr. Alexander K. Berkis on the Latvian persecution under Soviet hegemony.
- Dr. Martin A. Larson will dedicate this year's conference to British jurist F.J.P. Veale, author of the two-volume *The Veale File*.
- Sam Dixon on Abraham Lincoln and the genesis of the American Civil War.
- Former Chilean ambassador Miguel Serrano on the Third Reich and the Third World.
- Dr. Alexander E. Ronnett on Romanian Nationalism and the Legionary Movement.
- Ted O'Keefe on the Office of Special Investigations (OSI)/KGB connection.
- Ed Dieckmann, Jr. on ADL-sponsored school programs in "sensitivity training" and the "Holocaust."

Master of Ceremonies for the 1986 event will be historian Mark Weber.

• Reserve these dates on your calendar now • Hear and meet the people who are bringing the historical record into accord with the facts • Spend an event-filled weekend with revisionists from around the world • Meals, lodging and local transportation all to be arranged by the IHR

Write for registration application.
Attendance will be limited to space available.

INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW
POST OFFICE BOX 1306
TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA 90505